This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06823540 1

Wesley
9.5.8

THE

WORKS

OF THE

REV. JOHN WESLEY

VOLUME XV.

Containing,

ESSAYS AND LETTERS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

ASTOR LIBRARY NEW-YORK
NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

LONDON:

Printed at the Conference-Office, 14, City-Road,
BY THOMAS CORDEUX, AGENT.

SOLD BY THOMAS BLANSHARD, 14, CITY-ROAD; ALSO, BY J. BUTTERWORTH, FLEET-STREET; W. BAYNES, AND J. HAMILTON, PATERNOSTER ROW; AND W. KENT, HOLBORN.

1812.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

I.	*Thoughts upon Necessity* - -	1
II.	*Thoughts upon God's Sovereignty* -	22
III.	*The Question, "What is an Arminian?" Answered* - - -	25
IV.	*Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's Review of all the Doctrines taught by Mr. John Wesley*	29
V.	*Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's Farrago Double-distilled* - - -	75
VI.	*A Letter to a Roman Catholic* -	110
VII.	*A Roman Catechism: with a Reply thereto*	118
VIII.	*Popery calmly considered* - -	177
IX.	*The Advantages of the Members of the Church of England, over those of the Church of Rome* - - - -	199
X.	*A short Method of converting all the Roman Catholics in the Kingdom of Ireland*	209
XI.	*A Letter to the Printer of the Dublin Public Advertiser, occasioned by the late Act passed in Favour of Popery* -	214
XII.	*Two Letters to the Editors of the Freeman's Journal* - - -	218
XIII.	*The Origin of Image-Worship among Christians* - - -	231
XIV.	*A Disavowal of persecuting Papists* -	233
XV.	*Reasons against a Separation from the Church of England* -	236
XVI.	*Thoughts on Separation from the Church*	244
XVII.	*On the Church: in a Letter to the Rev. Mr.* ——— - - -	245
XVIII.	*Thoughts on the Consecration of Churches and Burial Grounds* - -	249
XIX.	*An Answer to an important Question* -	251
XX.	*Free Thoughts on the present State of Public Affairs* - . -	254
XXI.	*Thoughts upon Liberty* - -	277
XXII.	*Thoughts upon the Origin of Power* -	292
XXIII.	*A Calm Address to our American Colonies*	301

XXIV. *How far is it the Duty of a Christian Minister to preach Politics?* - 311

PIECES ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS, FROM THE METHODIST MAGAZINES.

XXV. *Thoughts on Salvation by Faith* 313
XXVI. *Further Thoughts on Necessity* - 318
XXVII. *On Hearing Ministers who oppose the Truth* - - 326
XXVIII. *Thoughts concerning Gospel Ministers* 327
XXIX. *Thoughts upon Methodism* - - 330
XXX. *Thoughts on the Manner of educating Children* - - 334
XXXI. *An Answer to Mr. Dodd* - 338
XXXII. *Of the Immortality of the Soul* - 343
XXXIII. *A Thought upon Marriage* - 346
XXXIV. *Thoughts upon Dissipation* - 348
XXXV. *A clear and concise Demonstration of the Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* - - - 351
XXXVI. *1 Thessalonians v. 23, elucidated* - 352
XXXVII. *Thoughts on Suicide* - - 353
XXXVIII. *Thoughts upon Taste* - 354
XXXIX. *Thoughts on the Power of Music* 360
XL. *Thoughts upon Jacob Behmen* 364
XLI. *Thoughts upon Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws* - - 369
XLII. *Thoughts on the Character and Writings of Mr. Prior* - 372
XLIII. *Thoughts on Nervous Disorders* - 380
XLIV. *Thoughts on Genius* - - 386
XLV. *Thoughts on Memory* - 389
XLVI. *A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Hervey* 390
XLVII. *Second Letter to Ditto* - 412
XLVIII. *To the Rev. Mr. Walker* - 413
XLIX. *Second Letter to Ditto* - 416
L. *Third to Ditto* - - 421
LI. *Fourth to Ditto* - - 426

Thoughts upon Necessity.

TO THE READER.

I HAD finished what I designed to say on this subject, when the *Essay on Liberty and Necessity* fell into my hands. A most elaborate Piece, touched and retouched with all possible care. This has occasioned a considerable enlargement of the following Tract. I would fain place mankind in a fairer point of view than that Writer has done: as I cannot believe the noblest creature in the visible world to be only a fine piece of clock-work.

IS Man a *Free-Agent*, or is he not? Are his actions *free* or *necessary*? Is he self-determined in acting; or is he determined by some other Being? Is the principle which determines him to act, in himself or in another? This is the question which I want to consider. And is it not an important one? Surely there is not one of greater importance in the whole nature of things. For what is there that more nearly concerns all that are born of women? What can be conceived, which more deeply affects, not some only, but every child of man?

I. 1. That Man is not Self-determined, that the Principle of Action is lodged, not in himself, but in some other being, has been an exceedingly ancient opinion, yea, near as old

as the foundation of the world. It seems, none that admit of Revelation can have any doubt of this. For it was unquestionably the sentiment of Adam, soon after he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. He imputes what he had done not to himself, but another: *The woman whom thou gavest me.* It was also the sentiment of Eve: *The serpent he beguiled me, and I did eat.* It is true, *I* did eat: but the cause of my eating, the spring of my action, was in *another*.

2. The same opinion, That Man is not self-determined, took root very early, and spread wide, particularly in the Eastern world, many ages before Manes was born. Afterwards indeed he and his followers, commonly called Manichees, formed it into a regular system. They not only maintained, that all the Actions of Man were necessarily determined by a power exterior to himself, but likewise accounted for it, by ascribing the good to Oromasdes, the Parent of all Good: the evil to the other independent Being, Arimanius, the Parent of all Evil.

3. From the Eastern World, "When Arts and Empire learned to travel West," this opinion travelled with them into Europe, and soon found its way into Greece. Here it was earnestly espoused and vehemently maintained by the *Stoic Philosophers:* Men of great renown among persons of literature, and some of the ablest disputants in the world. These affirmed with one mouth, That from the beginning of the world, if not rather from all eternity, there was an indissoluble chain of causes and effects, which included all human Actions. And that these were by fate so connected together, that not one link of the chain could be broken.

4. A fine writer of our own country, who was a few years since gathered to his fathers, has, with admirable skill, drawn the same conclusion, from different premises. He lays it down as a principle, (and a principle it is, which cannot reasonably be denied,) That as long as the soul is vitally united to the body, all its operations depend on the body: That in particular all our thoughts depend upon the vibrations of the fibres of the brain; and of consequence

vary, more or less, as those vibrations vary. In that expression, *our Thoughts*, he comprises all our Sensations, all our reflections and passions: yea, and all our Volitions, and consequently our Actions, which he supposes, unavoidably follow those vibrations. He premises, "But you will say, this Scheme infers the universal necessity of human Actions: And frankly adds, "Certainly it does. I am sorry for it: But I cannot help it."

5. And this is the Scheme which is now adopted, by not a few of the most sensible men in our nation. One of these fairly confessing, that "He did not think himself a sinner," was asked, "Do you never feel any wrong Tempers? And do you never speak or act in such a manner as your own Reason condemns?" He candidly answered, "Indeed I do. I frequently feel tempers, and speak many words, and do many actions, which I do not approve of. But I cannot avoid it. They result, whether I will or not, from the vibrations of my Brain, together with the motion of my blood, and the flow of my animal Spirits. But these are not in my own power. I cannot help them. They are independent on my choice. And therefore I cannot apprehend myself to be a sinner on this account."

6. Very lately another Gentleman in free conversation, was carrying this matter a little further. Being asked, "Do you believe GOD is Almighty?" He answered, "I do; or he could not have made the world." "Do you believe he is wise?" "I cannot tell. Much may be said on both sides." "Do you believe he is Good?" "No. I cannot believe it: I believe just the contrary. For all the evil in the world is owing to Him: I can ascribe it to no other cause. I cannot blame that cur for barking or biting: it is his nature: and he did not make himself. I feel wrong tempers in myself. But that is not *my* fault; for I cannot help it. It is my nature: And I could not prevent my having this nature, neither can I change it."

7. The Assembly of Divines, who met at Westminster in the last Century, express very nearly the same sentiment, though placed in a different light. They speak to this

effect: "Whatever happens in time, was unchangeably determined from all eternity. GOD ordained or ever the world was made, all the things that should come to pass therein. The greatest and the smallest events, were equally predetermined; in particular all the thoughts, all the words, all the actions of every child of man: All that every man thinks, or speaks, or does, from his birth, till his Spirit returns to God that gave it." It follows, that no man can do either more or less good, or more or less evil than he does. None can think, speak, or act, any otherwise than he does, not in any the smallest circumstance. In all, he is bound by an invisible, but more than adamantine chain. No man can move his head or foot, open or shut his eyes, lift his hand, or stir a finger, any otherwise than as GOD determined he should, from all eternity.

8. That this chain is *invisible*, they allow: Man himself perceives nothing of it. He suspects nothing less: He imagines himself to be free in all his Actions. He *seems* to move hither and thither, to go this way or that, to choose doing evil, or doing good, just at his own discretion. But all this is an entire mistake, it is no more than a pleasing dream. For all his ways are fixed, as the pillars of heaven; all unalterably determined. So that notwithstanding these gay, flattering appearances,

"In spite of all the labour we create,
We only *row*; but we are steer'd by Fate!"

9. A late Writer, in his celebrated book upon *Free-will*, explains the matter thus. "The soul is now connected with a material vehicle, and placed in the material world. Various objects here continually strike upon one or other of the bodily organs. These communicate the impression to the Brain; consequent on which such and such sensations follow. These are the materials on which the Understanding works, in forming all its simple and complex ideas: according to which our judgments are formed. And according to our Judgments are our Passions; our Love and Hate, Joy and Sorrow, Desire and Fear, with their innumerable combinations. Now all these Passions together are *the Will*

*

variously modified. And all Actions flowing from the Will, are *voluntary* Actions. Consequently they are Good or Evil, which otherwise they could not be. And yet it is not in man to direct his own way, while he is in the body, and in the World."

10. The Author of an *Essay on Liberty and Necessity*, published some years since at Edinburgh, speaks still more explicitly, and endeavours to trace the matter to the foundation. "The impressions," says he, "which man receives in the Natural world, do not correspond to the truth of things. Thus the Qualities called Secondary, which we by natural instinct attribute to matter, belong not to Matter, nor exist without us: But all the Beauty of colours with which Heaven and Earth *appear* clothed, is a sort of romance or illusion. For in external objects there is really no other distinction, but that of the size and arrangement of their constituent parts, whereby the rays of light are variously reflected and refracted," p. 152, &c.

"In the Moral World, whatever is a cause, with regard to its proper effect, is an effect with regard to some prior cause, and so backward without end. Events therefore being a train of causes and effects, are necessary and fixed. Every one must be, and cannot be other ways than it is," p. 157, &c.

"And yet a feeling of an opposite kind is deeply rooted in our nature. Many things *appear* to us, as not predetermined by any invariable law. We naturally make a distinction, between things that *must be*, and things that *may be*, or *may not*.

"So with regard to the Actions of men. We see that connexion between an action and its motive to be so strong, that we reason with full confidence, concerning the future actions of others. But if Actions necessarily arise from their proper motives, then all human actions are necessary and fixed. Yet they do not *appear* so to us. Indeed before any particular action, we always judge, that the Action will be the necessary result of some motive. But

afterwards the feeling instantly varies. We accuse and condemn a man for doing what is wrong. We conceive, he had a power of acting otherwise, and the whole train of our feelings suppose him to have been entirely a free Agent."

"But what does this Liberty amount to? In all cases, our choice is determined by some motive. It *must be* determined by that motive, which appears the best upon the whole. But motives are not under our power or direction. When two motives offer, we have not the power of choosing as we please. We are necessarily determined."

"Man is passive in receiving impressions of things; according to which the Judgment is necessarily formed. This the Will necessarily obeys, and the outward action necessarily follows the Will.

"Hence it appears, that GOD decrees all future Events. He who gave such a nature to his creatures, and placed them in such circumstances, that a certain train of actions must necessarily follow: He who did so, and who must have foreseen the consequences, did certainly decree, That those events should fall out, and that men should act just as they do.

"The Deity is the First Cause of all things. He formed the plan on which all things were to be governed, and put it in execution by establishing both in the Natural and Moral World, certain Laws that are fixed and immutable. By virtue of these, all things proceed in a regular train of causes and effects, bringing about the events contained in the original plan, and admitting the possibility of no other. This Universe is a vast Machine winded up and set a-going. The several springs and wheels act unerringly upon one another. The hand advances and the clock strikes, precisely as the Artist has determined. In this plan, Man, a rational creature, was to fulfil certain ends. He was to *appear* as *an Actor*, and to act with consciousness and spontaneity. Consequently it was necessary he should have some Idea of Liberty, some feeling of things possible and contingent, things depending on himself, that he might be led to exercise that activity, for which he was designed. To have

seen himself a part of that great Machine, would have been altogether incongruous to the ends he was to fulfil. Had he seen that nothing was contingent, there would have been no room for forethought, nor for any sort of industry or care. Reason could not have been exercised in the way it is now; that is, man could not have been man. But now, the moment he comes into the world, he acts as a free-agent. And Contingency, though it has no real existence in things, is made to appear as really existing. Thus is our natural feeling directly opposite to truth and matter of fact: seeing it is certainly impossible, that any man should act any otherwise than he does."

See Necessity drawn at full length, and painted in the most lively colours!

II. 1. It is easy to observe, That every one of these Schemes implies the universal Necessity of human Actions. In this they all agree, that Man is not a *free*, but a *necessary* Agent, being absolutely determined in all his Actions, by a principle exterior to himself. But they do not agree, what that principle is. The most ancient of them, the Manichæan, maintained, that men are determined to evil, by the evil God, Arimanius: That Oromasdes, the Good GOD, would prevent, or remove that evil, but cannot: the power of the evil God being so great, that he is not able to control it.

2. The Stoics, on the other hand, did not impute the evil that is in the world to any intelligent principle, but either to the original stubbornness of matter, which even Divine Power was not capable of removing: To the concatenation of Causes and Effects, which no power whatever could alter: Or to unconquerable Fate, to which they supposed all the gods, the Supreme not excepted, to be subject.

3. The Author of two volumes entitled *Man*, rationally rejects all the preceding Schemes, while he deduces all human Actions from those Passions and Judgments, which, during the present union of the Soul and Body, necessarily result from such and such vibrations of the fibres of the Brain. Herein he indirectly ascribes the necessity of all

human Actions to GOD: who having fixed the laws of this vital Union, according to his own good pleasure; having so constitued man, that the motions of the Soul thus depend on the fibres of the Body, has thereby laid him under an invincible necessity of acting thus, and in no other manner. So do those likewise, who suppose all the Judgments and Passions necessarily to flow from the motion of the Blood and Spirits. For this is indirectly to impute all our Passions and Actions to Him, who alone determined the manner wherein our Blood and Spirits should move.

4. The Gentleman next mentioned does this directly, without any softening or circumlocution at all. He flatly and roundly affirms, The Creator is the proper Author of every thing which man does: That by creating him thus, He has absolutely determined the manner wherein he shall act; and that therefore man can no more help sinning, than a stone can help falling. The Assembly of Divines do as directly ascribe the necessity of human Actions to GOD, in affirming, That GOD has eternally determined whatsoever shall be done in time. So likewise does Mr. Edwards of New England: in proving by abundance of deep, metaphysical reasoning, That "we *must* see, hear, taste, feel the objects that surround us, and *must* have such Judgments, Passions, Actions, and no other. He flatly ascribes the necessity of all our Actions, to him who united our souls to these bodies, placed us in the midst of these objects, and ordered, that these Sensations, Judgments, Passions, and Actions, should spring therefrom.

5. The Author last cited connects together and confirms all the preceding Schemes; particularly those of the ancient Stoics and the modern Calvinists.

III. 1. It is not easy for a man of common understanding, especially if unassisted by Education, to unravel these finely woven Schemes, or shew distinctly, where the fallacy lies. But he knows, he feels, he is certain, they cannot be true: that the Holy GOD cannot be the Author of sin. The horrid Consequences of supposing this, may appear to the meanest understanding from a few plain, obvious con-

siderations, of which every man that has common sense may judge.

1. If all the Passions, the Tempers, the Actions of men, are wholly independent on their own choice, are governed by a principle exterior to themselves, then there can be no Moral Good or Evil. There can be neither Virtue nor Vice, neither good nor bad Actions, neither good nor bad Passions or Tempers. The Sun does much good: but it is no Virtue: but he is not capable of Moral Goodness. Why is he not? For this plain reason, because he does not act from Choice. The sea does much harm: it swallows up thousands of men; but it is not capable of Moral Badness: because it does not act by choice, but from a necessity of Nature. If indeed one or the other can be said to *act* at all. Properly speaking it does not: it is purely passive: it is only acted upon by the Creator; and *must* move in this manner and no other, seeing it cannot resist HIS Will. In like manner, St. Paul did much good: but it was no virtue, if he did not act from choice. And if he was in all things necessitated to think and act, he was not capable of Moral Goodness. Nero does much evil: murders thousands of men, and sets fire to the city: but it is no fault: he is not capable of moral badness, if he does not act from choice but Necessity. Nay, properly the Man does not act at all: he is only acted upon by the Creator, and *must* move thus, being irresistibly impelled. For who can resist his Will?

2. Again. If all the Actions, and Passions, and Tempers of men are quite independent on their own choice, are governed by a principle exterior to themselves, then none of them is either rewardable or punishable, is either praise or blame-worthy. The consequence is undeniable: I cannot praise the Sun for warming, nor blame the Stone for wounding me: because neither the Sun nor the Stone acts from choice, but from necessity. Therefore neither does the latter deserve blame, nor the former deserve praise. Neither is the one capable of reward, nor the other of punishment. And if a man does good as necessarily as the

Sun, he is no more praise-worthy than that. If he does evil as necessarily as the Stone, he is no more blame-worthy. The dying to save your country is no way rewardable, if you are compelled thereto. And the betraying your country is no way punishable, if you are necessitated to do it.

3. It follows, if there be no such thing as virtue or vice, as moral Good or Evil, if there be nothing rewardable or punishable in the actions or passions of men, then there can be no Judgment to come, and no future Rewards and Punishments. For might not God as well judge the Trees of the wood, or the Stones of the field as man, if man be as totally passive as they? As irresistibly determined to think, speak, and act thus or thus? What should he be commended or rewarded for, who never did any good, but when he could not help it, being impelled thereto by a force which he could not withstand? What should he be blamed or punished for, who never did any evil, to which he was not determined by a power he could no more resist, than he could shake the pillars of Heaven?

This objection the Author of the Essay gives in its full strength. "The advocates for Liberty reason thus. If Actions be necessary, and not in our own power, what ground is there for blame, self-condemnation, or remorse? If a Clock were sensible of its own motions, and knew that they proceeded according to necessary laws, could it find fault with itself for striking wrong? Would it not blame the Artist, who had so ill adjusted the wheels? So that upon this scheme, all the moral Constitution of our nature is overturned. There is an end to all the operations of Conscience, about Right and Wrong. Man is no longer a Moral Agent, nor the subject of praise or blame for what he does."

He strangely answers, "Certainly the pain, the remorse which is felt by any man who had been guilty of a bad action, springs from the notion, that he has a power over his own actions, that he might have forborne to do it. It is on this account, that he is angry at himself, and confesses himself to be blamable. That uneasiness proceeds on the

supposition, that he is free, and might have acted a better part. And one under the dominion of bad passions is condemned upon this ground, that it was in his power to be free from them. Were not this the case, Brutes might be the objects of moral blame as well as man. But we do not blame them, because they have not freedom, a power of directing their own actions. We must, therefore, admit, that the idea of freedom, is essential to the moral feeling. On the system of universal Necessity, there could be no place for blame or remorse. And we struggle in vain to reconcile to this system, the testimony which Conscience clearly gives to Freedom."

Is this an answer to the objection? Is it not fairly giving up the whole cause?

He adds, "A feeling of Liberty, which I now scruple not to call *deceitful*, is interwoven with our nature. Man must be so constituted, in order to attain Virtue." To attain Virtue! Nay, you have yourself allowed, that on this supposition, Virtue and Vice can have no being. You go on. "If he saw himself as he really is," [Sir, do not *you* see yourself so?] "if he conceived himself and all his actions, necessarily linked into the great chain, which renders the whole order both of the natural and moral World unalterably determined in every article, what would follow?" Why just nothing at all. The great chain must remain as it was before: since whatever you see or conceive, that is "unalterably determined in every article."

To confute himself still more fully, he says, "If we knew Good and Evil to be necessary and unavoidable," [Contradiction in terms; but let it pass] "there would be no more place for praise or blame: no indignation at those who had abused their rational powers; no sense of just punishment annexed to crimes, or of any reward deserved by good actions. All these feelings vanish at once, with the feeling of Liberty. And the sense of *Duty* must be quite extinguished; for we cannot conceive any *Moral Obligation*, without supposing a power in the Agent over his own actions."

If so, What is he, who publishes a book, to shew Mankind, that they have no power over their own actions?

To the objection, That this scheme "makes God the Author of Sin," the Essayist feebly answers, "Sin, or moral turpitude lies in the evil Intention of him that commits it; or in some wrong Affection. Now there is no wrong intention in God." What then? Whatever wrong intention or affection is in man, you make God the direct author of it. For you flatly affirm, "Moral evil cannot exist, without being permitted of God. And with regard to a first Cause, *permitting* is the same thing as *causing*." That I totally deny: but if it be, God is the proper cause of all the sin in the universe.

4. Suppose now the Judge of all the earth, having just pronounced the awful sentence, *Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels*, should say to one on the left hand, "What canst thou offer, in thy own behalf?" Might he not on this scheme, answer, "Lord, why am I doomed to dwell with everlasting burnings? For not doing good? Was it ever in my power to do any good action? Could I ever do any, but by that grace which thou hadst determined not to give me? For doing evil? Lord, did I ever do any, which I was not bound to do by thy own decree? Was there ever a moment when it was in my power, either to do good, or to cease from evil? Didst not thou fix whatever I should do, or not do, or ever I came into the world? And was there ever one hour, from my cradle to my grave, wherein I could act otherwise than I did?" Now, let any man say, Whose mouth would be stopped, that of the criminal, or the Judge?

5. But if upon this supposition, there can be no Judgment to come, and no future Rewards or Punishments; it likewise follows, That the Scriptures, which assert both, cannot be of divine original. If there be not *a day wherein GOD will judge the world, by that man whom he hath appointed;* if the wicked *shall* not *go into eternal punishment*, neither the righteous *into life eternal:* what can we think of

that book, which so frequently and solemnly affirms all these things? We can no longer maintain, That *all Scripture was given by Inspiration of GOD*, since it is impossible, that the GOD of Truth, should be the Author of palpable falsehoods. So that whoever asserts the pre-determination of all human actions, a doctrine totally inconsistent with the scriptural doctrines of a future Judgment, Heaven and Hell, strikes hereby at the very foundation of Scripture, which must necessarily stand or fall with them.

6. Such absurdities will naturally and necessarily follow, from the scheme of Necessity. But Mr. Edwards has found out a most ingenious way of evading this consequence. "I grant," (says that good and sensible man,) "if the actions of men were *involuntary*, the consequence would inevitably follow; they could not be either good or evil: nor, therefore, could they be the proper object, either of reward or punishment. But here lies the very ground of your mistake: their actions are not *involuntary*. The actions of men are quite *voluntary*: the fruit of their own *will*. They love, they desire evil things; therefore they commit them. But love and hate, desire and aversion are only several modes of *willing*. Now if men voluntarily commit theft, adultery, or murder, certainly the actions are evil, and therefore punishable. And if they voluntarily serve GOD, and help their neighbours, the actions are good, and therefore rewardable."

7. I cannot possibly allow the consequence, upon Mr. Edwards's supposition. Still I say, if they are *necessitated* to commit robbery or murder, they are not punishable for committing it. But you answer, "Nay, their actions are voluntary, the fruit of their own will." If they are, yet that is not enough, to make them either good or evil. For their will, on *your* supposition, is irresistibly impelled: so that they cannot help willing thus or thus. If so, they are no more blameable for *that Will*, than for the actions which follow it. There is no blame, if they are under a *necessity* of willing. There can be no moral Good or Evil, unless they have *Liberty* as well as *Will*, which is entirely

a different thing. And the not adverting to this, seems to be the direct occasion of Mr. Edwards's whole mistake.

8. GOD created Man an *Intelligent* Being; and endued him with *Will* as well as Understanding. Indeed it seems, without this, his understanding would have been given to no purpose. Neither would either his Will or Understanding have answered any valuable purpose, if *Liberty* had not been added to them, a power distinct from both; a power of choosing for himself, a self-determining Principle. It may be doubted, whether GOD ever made an intelligent creature, without all these three faculties? Whether any Spirit ever existed without them? Yea, whether they are not implied in the very nature of a Spirit? Certain it is, that no Being can be accountable for its Actions which has not Liberty, as well as Will and Understanding.

How admirably is this painted by Milton supposing GOD to speak concerning his new-made Creature.

——— "I made him just and right,
Sufficient to have stood, though free to fall.
Such I created all th' ethereal powers—
Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell.
Not free, what proof could they have given sincere
Of true allegiance, constant faith and love,
Where only what they *needs must do* appear'd,
Not what they *would*. What praise could they receive,
What pleasure I, from such obedience paid,
When Will and Reason (Reason also is Choice)
Useless and vain, of freedom both despoil'd
Made passive both, had serv'd *Necessity*,
Not *me*? They therefore, as to right belong'd,
So were created.—
So without least impulse or shadow of fate
Or ought by me immutably foreseen
They trespass, authors to themselves in all,
Both what they judge and what they choose: For so
I form'd them free; and free they must remain,
Till they enthrall themselves. I else must change

†

Their Nature and reverse the high decree,
Unchangeable, eternal, which ordain'd
Their freedom: they themselves ordain'd their fall."

Paradise Lost, Book III.

9. It seems, they who divide the faculties of the human Soul, into the Understanding, Will, and Affections, unless they make the Will and Affections the same thing; (and then how inaccurate is the Division?) must mean by Affections, the Will, properly speaking, and by the term *Will*, neither more nor less than *Liberty*: the power of Choosing either to do or not to do, (commonly called Liberty of *Contradiction*,) or to do this or the contrary, Good or Evil, commonly called Liberty of *Contrariety*. Without the former at least, there can be nothing good or evil, rewardable or punishable. But it is plain, the doctrine of Necessity, as taught either by ancient Heathens, or by the moderns, (whether Deists or Christians,) destroys both, leaves not a shadow of either, in any soul of man. Consequently it destroys all the Morality of human Actions, making man a mere Machine, and leaves no room for any Judgment to come, or for either Rewards or Punishments.

IV. 1. But whatever be the consequences deducible from this, That all human actions are necessary, how will you answer the Arguments which are brought, in defence of this position? Let us try, whether something of this kind, may not be done in a few words.

Indeed as to the first Scheme, that of the Manichees, the maintainers of a Good and an Evil God, though it was formerly espoused by men of renown, St. Augustine in particular; yet it is now so utterly out of date, that it would be lost labour to confute it. A little more plausible is the Scheme of the *Stoics* building Necessity upon *Fate*, upon the insuperable stubbornness of *Matter*, or the indissoluble *Chain* of Causes and Effects. Perhaps they invented this Scheme, to exculpate GOD; to avoid laying the blame upon Him; by allowing, He would have done better, if he could: that he was *willing* to cure the evil, but was not *able*. But we may answer them short,

There is no Fate above the most High; that is an idle irrational Fiction: neither is there any thing in the nature of *Matter*, which is not obedient to his word. The Almighty is able in the twinkling of an eye, to reduce any matter into any form he pleases: or to speak it into nothing; in a moment to expunge it out of his Creation.

2. The still more plausible Scheme of Dr. Hartley, (and I might add, those of the two Gentlemen above-mentioned, which nearly coincide with it) now adopted by almost all who doubt of the Christian System, requires a more particular consideration, were it only because it has so many admirers. And it certainly contains a great deal of truth, as will appear to any that considers it calmly. For who can deny, that not only the memory, but all the Operations of the Soul are now dependent on the bodily Organs, the Brain, in particular? Insomuch that a blow on the back part of the head, (as frequent experience shews,) may take away the Understanding, and destroy at once both Sensation and Reflection: and an irregular flow of Spirits may quickly turn the deepest Philosopher into a Madman. We must allow likewise, that while the very power of thinking depends so much upon the Brain, our Judgments must needs depend thereon, and in the same proportion. It must be farther allowed, that as our Sensations, our Reflections, and our Judgments, so our Will and Passions also, which naturally follow from our Judgments, ultimately depend on the Fibres of the Brain. But does all this infer the total Necessity of all human actions? "I am sorry for it, says the Dr. but I cannot help it." I verily think I can. I think, I can not only *cut* the knot, by shewing (as above) the intolerable absurdities which this Scheme implies; but fairly *untie* it, by pointing out just where the fallacy lies.

3. But first permit me to say a word to the Author of the Essay. His grand reason, for supposing all mankind in a dream, is drawn from Analogy, "We are in a continual delusion as to the Natural World: Why not as to the Moral?" Well: how does he prove, that we are in a continual delusion as to the Natural World? Thus. All the

Qualities which are termed Secondary Qualities, we by a natural instinct ascribe to Matter. But it is a mere deceit. They do not belong to Matter, neither exist without us."

As commonly as this is asserted, it is absolutely false, as will appear quickly.

You instance in Colours, and confidently say, "All this beauty of Colours with which heaven and earth appear to be clothed, is a sort of romance or illusion. In external objects, there is no other distinction, but that of the size and arrangement of their constituent parts, whereby the rays of light are variously reflected or refracted."

But are those *rays of light* real? And do they exist without us? Certainly, as much as the Sun does. And are the *constituent parts* of those objects real? No body questions it. But are they really such a *size*, and *arranged* in such a manner? They are: and what will you infer from that? I infer, that Colour is just as real as Size or Figure; and that all Colours do as really exist without us, as trees, or corn, or heaven, or earth. "But what do you mean by Colour?" When I say, That Cloth is of a red Colour, I mean, its surface is so disposed as to reflect the red (that is, the largest) rays of light. When I say, The Sky is blue, I mean, it is so disposed as to reflect the blue (that is, the smallest) rays of light. And where is the delusion here? Does not that disposition, do not those rays as really exist, as either the Cloth, or the Sky? And are they not as really reflected, as the Ball in a tennis court? It is true, when they strike upon my eye, a particular sensation follows in my Soul. But that sensation is not Colour: I know no one that calls it so. Colour therefore is a real, material thing. There is no illusion in the case, unless you confound the perception with the thing perceived. And all other Secondary Qualities are just as real as Figure or any other Primary one. So you have no illusion in the natural world, to countenance that which you imagine to be in the moral. Wherever therefore this argument occurs, (and it occurs ten times over,) "The natural world is all illusion; therefore so is the moral," it is just good for nothing.

But take it altogether, and what a supposition is this! Is it not enough to make one's blood run cold? "The Great GOD, the Creator of Heaven and earth, the Father of the Spirits of all flesh, the God of Truth has encompassed with Falsehood every soul that he has made!—Has *given up* all mankind *to a strong delusion*, to believe a lie: yea, all his creation is a lie, all the Natural and all the Moral World." If so, you make GOD himself, rather than the Devil, (horrid thought!) *the Father of lies!* Such you doubtless represent him, when you say not only that he has surrounded us with illusion on every side; but that the Feelings which he has interwoven with our inmost nature, are equally illusive! That

"All these shadows which for things we take,
Are but the empty Dreams, which in Death's sleep we make!"

And yet after this, you make a feint of disputing, in defence of a Material World! Inconsistency all over! What proof have we of this, what possible proof can we have, if we cannot trust our own Eyes, or Ears, or any, or all of our Senses? But it is certain, I can trust none of my senses, if I am a mere machine. For I have the testimony of all my outward and all my inward Senses, that I am a free Agent. If therefore I cannot trust them in this, I can trust them in nothing. Do not tell me, there are Sun, Moon, and Stars, or that there are Men, Beasts, or Birds in the World. I cannot believe one tittle of it, if I cannot believe what I feel in myself, namely, that it depends on *me*, and no other Being, whether I shall now open or shut my eyes, move my head hither and thither, or stretch my hand or my foot. If I am *necessitated* to do all this, contrary to the whole, both of my inward and outward Senses, I can believe nothing else, but must necessarily sink into universal Scepticism.

Let us now weigh the main Argument on which this Author builds the melancholy hypothesis of Necessity. "Actions necessarily arise from their several motives: therefore all human Actions are necessary." Again, "In

all cases the Choice must be determined, by that motive which appears the best upon the whole. But motives are not under our power. Man is passive in receiving impressions of things, according to which the last judgment is necessarily formed. This the Will necessarily obeys, and the outward Action necessarily follows the Will."

Let us take this boasted argument in pieces, and survey it part by part. 1. "Motives are not under our power." This is not universally true. Some are, some are not. That man has a strong motive to run his neighbour through, namely, violent Anger. And yet the Action does not *necessarily* follow. Often it does not follow at all; and where it does, not necessarily; he might have resisted that motive. 2. "In all cases the choice *must* be determined by that motive which appears the best upon the whole." This is absolutely false. It is flatly contrary to the experience of all mankind. Who may not say on many occasions, *Video meliora?* I know what I do, is not "best upon the whole?" 3. "Man is passive in receiving the impressions of things." Not altogether. Even here much depends on his own choice. In many cases he may or may not receive the impression: in most he may vary it greatly. 4. "According to these, his last Judgment is necessarily formed." Nay; this too depends much upon his Choice. Sometimes his first, sometimes his last Judgment, is according to the impressions which he has received: and frequently, it is not. 5. "This the Will necessarily obeys." Indeed it does not. The mind has an intrinsic power, of cutting off the connexion between the Judgment and the Will. 6. "And the outward Action necessarily follows the Will." Not so. The thing I would, I do not, and the thing I would not, that I do. Whatever then becomes of the chain of Events, this chain of argument has not one good link belonging to it.

3. But allowing all he contends for, That upon such vibrations of the brain, such sensations directly follow, and indirectly, (as the various Combinations and Results of them,) all our Judgments and Passions, and consequently

Words and Actions: yet this infers no necessity at all—if there be a GOD in the world. Upon this the whole matter turns. And,

"This circumstance the Doctor had forgot." And so indeed have almost the whole tribe of modern Philosophers. They do not at all take GOD into their account: they can do their whole business without him. But in truth this their wisdom is their folly: for no system either of Morality or Philosophy, can be complete, unless GOD be kept in view, from the very beginning to the end. Every true Philosopher will surely go at least as far as the poor Heathen Poet,

Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, καὶ εἰς Δία λήγετε Μοῦσαι.

"Muses, begin and end with GOD supreme!"

Now if there be a GOD, he cannot but have all Power over every creature that he has made. He must have equal Power over Matter and Spirits, over our Souls and Bodies. What are then all the vibrations of the Brain to Him? Or all the *natural* Consequences of them? Suppose there be *naturally* the strongest Concatenation of Vibrations, Sensations, Reflections, Judgments, Passions, Actions; cannot He in a moment, whenever and however he pleases, destroy that Concatenation? Cannot he cut off, or suspend, in any degree, the Connexion between vibrations and sensations? Between sensations and reflections? Between reflections and judgments? And between judgments and passions or actions? We cannot have any idea of GOD's Omnipotence, without seeing, he can do this, if he will.

4. "If he will, you may say, we know he *can*. But have we any reason to think he *will?*" Yes; the strongest reason in the world, supposing that *GOD is Love:* More especially suppose he *is loving to every Man*, and that *his Mercy is over all his works*. If so, it cannot be, that he should see the noblest of his creatures under heaven, necessitated to do evil, and incapable of any relief but from himself, without affording that relief. It is undeniable, that he has fixed in man, in every man, his Umpire, Con-

science; an inward Judge, which passes sentence both on his Passions and Actions, either approving or condemning them. Indeed it has not power to remove what it condemns: it shews the evil which it cannot *cure*. But the GOD of Power *can* cure it: and the GOD of Love *will*,—if we choose he should. But he will no more necessitate us to be happy, than he will permit any thing beneath the sun to lay us under a necessity of being miserable. I am not careful therefore about the flowing of my blood and spirits, or the vibrations of my brain: being well assured, that however my spirits may flow, or my nerves and fibres vibrate, the Almighty GOD of Love can control them all, and will (unless I obstinately choose vice and misery) afford me such help, as in spite of all these, will put it into my power to be virtuous and happy for ever.

GLASGOW, *May* 14, 1774.

THOUGHTS

ON

GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY.

GOD reveals himself under a two-fold character; as a Creator, and as a Governor. These are no way inconsistent with each other: but they are totally different.

As a Creator, he has acted, in all things, according to his own Sovereign Will. Justice has not, cannot have, any place here; for nothing is due to what has no being. Here therefore he may, in the most absolute sense, "do what he will with his own." Accordingly, he created the heavens and the earth, and all things that are therein, in every conceivable respect, "according to his own good pleasure." 1. He began his creation, at what time, or rather at what part of Eternity, it seemed him good. Had it pleased him, it might have been millions of years sooner, or millions of ages later. 2. He determined, by his Sovereign Will, the duration of the Universe; whether it should last seven thousand, or seven hundred thousand, or numberless millions of years. 3. By the same, he appointed the place of the universe, in the immensity of space. 4. Of his Sovereign Will, he determined the number of the stars, of all the component parts of the universe, and the magnitude of every atom, of every fixed star, every planet, and every comet. 5. As Sovereign, he created the earth, with all the furniture of it, whether animate or inanimate; and gave to each such a nature, with such properties. 6. Of his own good pleasure, he made such a creature as man, and, in consequence of his spiritual nature, endued him with understanding, will, and liberty. 7. He

hath determined the times for every nation to come into being, with the bounds of their habitation. 8. He has allotted the time, the place, the circumstances, for the birth of each individual.

"If of parents I came,
That honour'd thy name,
'Twas thy goodness appointed it so."

9. He has given to each a body as it pleased him, weak or strong, healthy or sickly. This implies, 10. That he gives them various degrees of understanding, and of knowledge, diversified by numberless circumstances. It is hard to say, how far this extends: what an amazing difference there is, as to the means of improvement, between one born and brought up in a pious English family, and one born and bred among the Hottentots. Only we are sure the difference cannot be so great, as to necessitate one to be good, or the other to be evil; to force one into everlasting glory, or the other into everlasting burnings. This cannot be, because it would suppose the character of God, as a Creator, to interfere with God, as a Governor: wherein he does not, cannot possibly, act according to his own mere Sovereign Will; but, as he has expressly told us, according to the invariable rules both of Justice and Mercy.

Whether therefore we can account for it or not, (which indeed we cannot in a thousand cases) we must absolutely maintain, that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. But he cannot reward the sun for shining, because the sun is not a free agent. Neither could he reward us, for letting our light shine before men, if we acted as necessarily as the sun. All reward, as well as all punishment, presupposes Free-agency; and whatever creature is incapable of choice, is incapable of either the one or the other.

Whenever therefore God acts, as a Governor, as a Rewarder, or Punisher, he no longer acts as a mere Sovereign, by his own sole will and pleasure; but as an impartial Judge, guided in all things by invariable Justice.

Yet it is true, that, in some cases, Mercy rejoices over

Justice; although Severity never does. God may reward more, but he will never punish more, than strict Justice requires. It may be allowed, that God acts as Sovereign, in convincing some souls of sin; arresting them in their mad career, by his resistless power. It seems also, that, at the moment of our conversion, he acts irresistibly. There may likewise be many irresistible touches, during the course of our Christian warfare; with regard to which every believer may say,

"In the time of my distress,
Thou hast my succour been,
In my utter helplessness
Restraining me from sin."

But still, as St. Paul might have been either obedient or "disobedient to the heavenly vision," so every individual may, after all that God has done, either improve his grace, or make it of none effect.

Whatever therefore it hath pleased God to do, of his Sovereign pleasure, as Creator of heaven and earth; and whatever his Mercy may do on particular occasions, over and above what Justice requires; the general rule stands firm as the pillars of heaven, "The Judge of all the earth *will* do right." He will "judge the world in righteousness," and every man therein, according to the strictest Justice. He will punish no man, for doing any thing which he could not possibly avoid; neither for omitting any thing which he could not possibly do. Every punishment supposes the offender might have avoided the offence, for which he is punished. Otherwise, to punish him would be palpably unjust, and inconsistent with the character of God our Governor.

Let then these two ideas, of God the Creator, the Sovereign Creator, and God the Governor, the Just Governor, be always kept apart. Let us distinguish them from each other, with the utmost care. So shall we give God the full glory of his Sovereign Grace, without impeaching his inviolable Justice.

THE QUESTION,

WHAT IS AN ARMINIAN?

ANSWERED.

1. TO say, "This man is an Arminian," has the same effect on many hearers, as to say, "This is a mad dog." It puts them into a fright at once: they run away from him with all speed and diligence: and will hardly stop, unless it be to throw a stone at the dreadful, mischievous animal.

2. The more unintelligible the word is, the better it answers the purpose. Those on whom it is fixed, know not what to do: not understanding what it means, they cannot tell what defence to make, or how to clear themselves from the charge. And it is not easy to remove the prejudice, which others have imbibed, who know no more of it, than that it is "something *very* bad," if not "*all* that is bad!"

3. To clear the meaning therefore of this ambiguous term, may be of use to many: to those who so freely pin this name upon others, that they may not say what they do not understand: to those that hear them, that they may be no longer abused by men saying they know not what: and to those upon whom the name is fixed, that they may know how to answer for themselves.

4. It may be necessary to observe, first, that many confound Arminians with Arians. But this is entirely a different thing: the one has no resemblance to the other. An Arian is one who denies the Godhead of Christ: we scarcely need say, the supreme, eternal Godhead; because there can be no God but the supreme, eternal God, unless we will make two gods, a great god, and a little one. Now,

none have ever more firmly believed, or more strongly asserted, the Godhead of Christ, than many of the (so called) Arminians have done; yea, and do at this day. Arminianism therefore (whatever it be) is totally different from Arianism.

5. The rise of the word was this, James Harmens, in Latin, Jacobus Arminius, was first one of the Ministers of Amsterdam, and afterwards Professor of Divinity at Leyden. He was educated at Geneva; but in the year 1591, began to doubt of the principles which he had till then received. And being more and more convinced that they were wrong, when he was vested with the Professorship, he publickly taught what he believed of the truth, till in the year 1609, he died in peace. But a few years after his death, some zealous men, with the Prince of Orange at their head, furiously assaulted all that held, what were called, *his Opinions*, and having procured them to be solemnly condemned, in the famous Synod of Dort, (not so numerous or learned, but fully as impartial as the Council, or Synod of Trent;) some were put to death, some banished, some imprisoned for life, all turned out of their employments, and made incapable of holding any office, either in Church or State.

6. The errors charged upon these (usually termed Arminians) by their opponents, are five, 1. That they deny *Original Sin*. 2. That they deny *Justification by Faith*. 3. That they deny *Absolute Predestination*. 4. That they deny the Grace of God to be *irresistible*; and, 5. That they affirm, a Believer may *fall from Grace*.

With regard to the two first of these Charges, they plead, Not guilty. They are entirely false. No man that ever lived, not John Calvin himself, ever asserted either Original Sin, or Justification by Faith, in more strong, more clear, and express terms, than Arminius has done. These two points, therefore, are to be set out of the question: in these both parties agree. In this respect there is not an hair's breadth difference between Mr. WESLEY and Mr. WHITEFIELD.

7. But there is an undeniable difference between the Calvinists and Arminians, with regard to the three other Questions. Here they divide: the former believe *Absolute*, the latter, only *Conditional Predestination*. The Calvinists hold, 1. God has absolutely decreed, from all eternity, to save such and such persons, and no others, and that Christ died for these, and none else. The Arminians hold, God has decreed from all eternity, touching all that have the written word, "He that believeth shall be saved: he that believeth not, shall be condemned:" and in order to this, "Christ died for all, all that were dead in trespasses and sins," that is, for every child of Adam, since *in Adam all died*.

8. The Calvinists hold, Secondly, That the saving Grace of God is absolutely *irresistible*: that no man is any more able to resist it, than to resist the stroke of lightning. The Arminians hold, that, although there may be some moments wherein the Grace of God acts irresistibly, yet in general any man may resist, and that to his eternal ruin, the Grace whereby it was the will of God, he should have been eternally saved.

9. The Calvinists hold, Thirdly, That a true Believer in Christ, cannot possibly fall from Grace. The Arminians hold, That a true Believer may "make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience;" that he may fall, not only *foully*, but *finally*, so as to perish for ever.

10. Indeed the two latter points, Irresistible Grace, and Infallible Perseverance, are the natural consequence of the former, of the unconditional Decree. For if God has eternally and absolutely decreed to save such and such persons, it follows, both, that they cannot resist his saving Grace, (else they might miss of salvation;) and that they cannot finally fall from that Grace which they cannot resist. So that in effect, the three questions come into one, "Is Predestination Absolute or Conditional?" The Arminians believe, it is Conditional: the Calvinists, that it is Absolute.

11. Away then with all ambiguity: away with all ex-

pressions which only puzzle the cause. Let honest men speak out, and not play with hard words, which they do not understand: and how can any man know what Arminius held, who has never read one page of his writings? Let no man bawl, against Arminians, till he knows what the term means. And then he will know that Arminians and Calvinists are just upon a level. And Arminians have as much right to be angry at Calvinists, as Calvinists have to be angry at Arminians. John Calvin was a pious, learned, sensible man: and so was James Harmens. Many Calvinists are pious, learned, sensible men: and so are many Arminians. Only the former hold Absolute Predestination, the latter, Conditional.

12. One word more. Is it not the duty of every Arminian Preacher, first, never in public or in private, to use the word *Calvinist* as a term of reproach; seeing it is neither better nor worse than *calling names?* A practice no more consistent with good sense, or good manners, than it is with Christianity. Secondly, To do all that in him lies, to prevent his hearers from doing it, by shewing them the sin and folly of it? And is it not equally the duty of every Calvinist Preacher, First, never in public or in private, in preaching, or in conversation, to use the word *Arminian* as a term of reproach? Secondly, to do all that in him lies, to prevent his hearers from doing it, by shewing them the sin and folly thereof? And that the more earnestly and diligently, if they have been accustomed to do it? Perhaps encouraged therein by his own example?

SOME

REMARKS

ON

MR. HILL'S REVIEW OF ALL THE DOCTRINES

TAUGHT BY MR. JOHN WESLEY.

Humanum est nescire et errare.

Be calm in arguing: for fierceness makes
Error a fault, and truth discourtesy.
Why should I feel another man's mistakes,
More than his sickness or infirmity?
In love I should: but anger is not love,
Nor wisdom neither; therefore gently move.

HERBERT.

1. MR. HILL has an immense advantage over me: he abounds in time, and I in business. I cannot, therefore, undertake to write page for page; I have not leisure, if I had inclination. And indeed it is not needful. For a full confutation of whatsoever is cited from the Eleven Letters commonly ascribed to Mr. Hervey, I need only refer to Mr. Sellon: who has not only answered every shadow of an argument, contained in that poor piece of low invective, but even the reproaches; which, indeed, he could not pass over, without passing over great part of the book. If Mr. Hill is *afraid* to read that answer, I am sorry for it. And for whatever he advances on particular redemption, or any of the points connected therewith, I refer every one who is not afraid of the light, to those three tracts of Mr. Sellon,

"The Arguments against General Redemption answered," "God's Sovereignty vindicated against Elisha Coles," and "The Church of England vindicated from the charge of Calvinism." I believe if Mr. Hill had given this last a fair reading, he would know the 17th Article is nothing to his purpose.

2. With regard to his objections to Mr. FLETCHER, I refer all candid men to his own writings: his letters, intitled, "A First, Second, and Third Check to Antinomianism:" the rather, because there are very few of his arguments which Mr. H. even *attempts* to answer. It is true he promises "a full and particular answer to Mr. Fletcher's Second Check to Antinomianism." But it will puzzle any one to find where that answer is, except in the title page. And if any thing more is needful to be done, Mr. Fletcher is still able to answer for himself. But if he does, I would recommend to his consideration the advice formerly given by a wise man to his friend, "See that you humble not yourself to that man: it would hurt both him and the cause of God." It is a pity but he had considered it sooner, and he might have escaped some keen reflections. But he did not: he imagined when he spoke or wrote in the simplicity of his heart, that his opponents would have received his words in the same spirit wherein they were spoken. No such matter: they turn them all into poison: he not only *loses his sweet words*, but they are turned into bitterness, are interpreted as mere *sneer* and *sarcasm!* A good lesson for *me!* I had designed to have transcribed Mr. F.'s character of Mr. H. and to have added a little thereto, in hope of softening his spirit. But I see it is in vain; as well might one hope to soften

"Inexorable Pluto, king of shades!"

Since he is capable of putting such a construction, even upon Mr. F.'s gentleness and mildness; since he ascribes even to him "a pen dipped in gall," what will he not ascribe to *me?* I have done, therefore, with humbling myself to these men, to Mr. H. and his associates. I have humbled myself to them for these thirty years: but will do

it no more. I have done with attempting to soften their spirits: it is all lost labour. Upon men of an ingenuous temper, I have been able to fix an obligation. Bishop Gibson, Dr. Church, and even Dr. Taylor, were *obliged* to me for not pushing my advantage. But it is not so with these: whatever mercy you shew, you are to expect no mercy from them. Mercy did I say? Alas, I expect no justice; no more than I have found already. As they have wrested and distorted my words from the beginning, so I expect they will do to the end. Mr. H.'s performance is a specimen! Such mercy, such justice I am to expect!

3. And does Mr. Hill complain of the *unhappy spirit* in which Mr. Fletcher writes? Many writers have done marvellously: *but thou excellest them all!* For forty or fifty years have I been a little acquainted with controversial writers; some of the Romish persuasion, some of our own church, some dissenters of various denominations. And I have found many among them as *angry* as he: but one so *bitter* I have not found. Or one only, the author of those "excellent letters," as Mr. H. stiles them; which he particularly *admires*, (that is his word) and the *whole spirit* of which he has drank in. This is his peculiar character, his distinguishing grace; as a writer, *his name is Wormwood.* Accordingly he charges Mr. F. with a "*severe, acrimonious* spirit," with "sneer, sarcasm, and banter, yea with notorious falsehoods, calumny, and gross perversions," (p. 2.) Nay, "I accuse you, says he, of the grossest perversions and misrepresentations that ever proceeded from any author's pen." In the same spirit he is represented, (p. 21,) as "a slanderer of God's people and ministers, descending to the meanest quibbles, with a bitter, railing, acrimonious spirit." And, p. 27, (to go no farther,) as "using stratagem and ungenerous artifices." Although "I have treated *you*, says Mr. Hill, with all the politeness of a gentleman, and the humility of a Christian." Amazing! And has he not treated *me* so too? At present, take but one or two instances. "Forgeries have long passed for no crime with Mr. Wesley," (p. 27.) "He administers falsehoods and

damnable heresies, rank poison, hemlock, and ratsbane. We cannot allow him any other title than that of an empiric or quack doctor," (p. 29.) Which shall we admire most here! The Gentleman or the Christian?

4. There is something extremely odd in this whole affair. A man falls upon another, and gives him a good beating; who, in order to be revenged, does not grapple with *him*, (perhaps sensible that he is above his match,) but giving him two or three kicks, falls upon a third man that was standing by. "O, says he, but I know that fellow well; he is the *second* of him that beat me." "If he is, despatch your business with the former first, and then turn to him." However, if Mr. H. is resolved to fall upon *me*, I must defend myself as well as I can.

5. From the *spirit* and *manner* wherein he writes, let us now proceed to the *Matter*. But that is so various, and scattered up and down for a hundred and fifty pages, without much order or connection, that it is difficult to know where to begin. However all tends to one point; the good design of the writer is, to *blacken*. With this laudable view, he observes the old rule, "throw dirt enough, and some will stick." Knowing that the mud may be thrown in a trice; but it will take time and pains to scrape it off. Indeed he takes true pains to fasten it on; to represent Mr. W. as a knave and a fool; a man of no conscience, and no understanding. It is true the latter is insisted on most at large; by a hundred instances Mr. H. has made it plain to all the world, that Mr. W. never had three grains of common sense; that he is the veriest weather-cock that ever was; that he has not wit enough to be fixed in any thing, but is "tost to and fro continually;" "that he is to this very moment so absolutely unsettled with regard to every fundamental doctrine of the gospel, that no two disputants in the schools can be more opposite to each other than he is to himself."

6. But some may naturally ask, What is the matter? What makes Mr. H. so warm? What has Mr. W. done, that this gentleman, this Christian, *ita gladiatorio*

animo ad eum affectat viam? That he falls upon him thus outrageously, dagger out of sheath, without either rhyme or reason? O, the matter is plain. Beside that he is Mr. F.'s friend, he is an Arminian: and nothing is bad enough for an Arminian. An Arminian! What is that? "I cannot tell exactly: but to be sure it is all that is bad. For a Popish Fryar, a Benedictine Monk, bears witness, (and Mr. H. avers the same,) that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to Calvinism than to Arminianism; nearer by half to Mr. H.'s tenets than to Mr. W.'s." Truly I always thought so. But still I ask, What is an Arminian? Why, in other words, an *election-doubter*. And the "good old preacher," (says Mr. H.) "places all *election-doubters*, (i. e. those who are not clear in the belief of absolute predestination,) among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of these being brought before the judge, the judge tells him, To question election, is to overthrow a great doctrine of the gospel.—Therefore he, the election-doubter, must die," (p. 37.) That is plainly, he must die eternally, for this damnable sin. The very same thing Mr. H. affirms elsewhere, (p. 39,) "The only cement of Christian union is the love of God, and the foundation of that love *must be laid* in believing the *truths of God:*" (that is, you *must believe* particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God,) for, to use "The words of Dr. Owen, in his Display of Arminianism, (see the *truths* which Mr. H. means!) an agreement without truth is no peace, but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ."

7. I am sorry Mr. H. should think so. But so long as he remains in that sentiment, what peace am I, or Mr. F., or indeed any Arminian, to expect from him? Since any agreement with *us* would be "a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the kingdom of Christ." I therefore give up all hopes of peace with him, and with all that are thus minded. For I do not believe what he terms *the truths of God*, the doctrine of absolute predestination. I never did believe it, nor the doctrines connected with it, no

not for an hour. In this, at least, I have been consistent with myself. I have never varied an hair's breadth: I cannot, while I believe the Bible, while I believe either the Old or New Testament. What I do believe, and always have believed in this matter, I will declare with all simplicity.

"1. I believe no decree of *reprobation*. I do not believe the Father of spirits ever

"Consign'd one unborn soul to hell,
Or damn'd him from his mother's womb."

"2. I believe no decree of *preterition*, which is only reprobation white-washed. I do not believe God ever sent one man into the world, to whom he had decreed, never to give that grace, whereby alone he could escape damnation.

"3. I do not believe, (what is only preterition, or reprobation in other words,) any such *absolute election*, as implies that all but the *absolutely elect* shall inevitably be damned.

"4. I do not believe the doctrine of *irresistible grace*, or of *infallible perseverance;* because both the one and the other implies that election, which cannot stand without preterition or reprobation.

"5. I do not believe *salvation by works*. Yet if any man can prove, (what I judge none ever did, or ever will,) that there is no medium between this and absolute predestination; I will rather subscribe to this than to that, as far less absurd of the two."

8. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ*. Here is the source of Mr. H.'s implacable hatred to *me*. And hence arises his vehement displeasure at those *Minutes*, which Mr. Shirley and he style "dreadful heresy." The appellation is just, suppose (as Mr. H. asserts) all *election-doubters* are Diabolonians: suppose no man who is "not *clear* in the belief of absolute predestination," can love either God or his neighbour. For it is certain the doctrine of the *Minutes* and of the *Decrees* cannot stand together. If the doctrine of the decrees stands, then that of the minutes must fall; for we willingly allow, that the one is incompatible with the other.

If the doctrine of the Minutes stands, then that of the decrees must fall. For it is manifest that this, particularly the last article, strikes at the very root of Calvinism. Of what consequence is it then, to one who is persuaded the belief of Calvinism is *essential to salvation*, to expose those Minutes to the uttermost, as well as any that dares to defend them?

9. In order to this good end, Mr. H. publishes "A Review of *all the doctrines* taught by Mr. John Wesley." But is it possible for any man to do this, without reading *all the writings* that I have published? It is not possible in the nature of things: he cannot give an account of what he never read. And has Mr. H. read *all that I have published?* I believe he will not affirm it. So any man of understanding may judge, before he opens his book, what manner of review it is likely to contain! However it must be owned that he and his faithful allies have been at the pains of looking into many of my writings. I say many: for I apprehend there are many more, which they have not so much as *looked into;* nor does it appear that they have seriously *looked through* any, so as to observe the scope and tenor of them. However, from those which he or they have, after a fashion reviewed, abundance of objections are extracted. It is true, none of them (one only excepted) are new, and there is hardly one that has not been answered again and again. Yet since they are proposed in a new form, they may seem to demand a new answer.

10. The grand objection is, that I am inconsistent with myself. This therefore I shall particularly consider. The others, which flutter up and down the whole work, I can but just touch upon. Mr. H. opens the charge thus; "Saying and unsaying is nothing new with Mr. W. who has only shewn himself consistent, by a regular series of inconsistencies," (p. 3.) "How full are you of contradictions to yourself! How full of contrary purposes! How often do you chide with yourself! How oft do you fight with yourself!" (Title page.) "Mr. W. seems well contented you should settle his creed. If you can, you will do

in a few months, what he himself has not been able to effect in near forty years." "On this fluctuating ocean he has been tossed for so many years together," (p. 20.) "All his Journals and tracts are replete with proofs of his having been tossed from one system to another, and from one opinion to another, from the time of his ordination to this present moment," (p. 143.) "The most ignorant collier can immediately see his inconsistency with himself," (p. 145.) He sums up the whole charge in the lively words of Mr. Cudworth, graced with the name of Mr. Hervey: "Contradiction, didst thou ever know so trusty a friend, so faithful a devotee? Many people are ready enough to contradict others. But it seems all one to this gentleman whether it be another or himself, so he may but contradict."

11. To prove this indictment (urged home enough, tho' there is not one tittle of truth in it) Mr. H. has cited no less than a hundred and one witnesses.* Before I enter upon the examination of these, I beg leave to transcribe what I wrote some time since to Dr. Rutherforth. "You frequently charge me with evasion; and others have brought the same charge. The plain case is this, I have written on various heads, and always as clearly as I could. Yet many have misunderstood my words, and raised abundance of objections. I answered them by explaining myself, shewing what I did not mean, and what I did. One and another of the objectors stretched his throat, and cried out, 'Evasion! Evasion!' And what does all this outcry amount to? Why exactly thus much. They imagined they had tied me so fast, that it was impossible for me to escape. But presently the cobwebs were swept away, and I was quite at liberty. And I bless God I can unravel truth and falsehood, although artfully twisted together. Of *such*

* The very number of propositions extracted out of Quesnell's writings, and condemned "as dreadfu heresies," in the Bull *Unigenitus! Exemplum placet!* See how good wits jump! Mr. H., Father Walsh, and the Pope of Rome!

evasion I am not ashamed. Let them be ashamed who constrain me to use it."

12. Mr. H.'s numerous proofs of my contradicting myself, may be ranged under twenty-four heads. I shall examine these one by one, in what appears to me to be the most natural order.

I.

1. There was an everlasting covenant between God the Father and God the Son, concerning man's redemption.	There never was any such covenant between God the Father and God the Son. (p. 128.)

The latter of these I believe, and always did, since I could read my bible.

But Mr. H. brings a passage out of the Christian Library, to contradict this. On which he parades as follows: "If the Christian Library be, as Mr. W. affirms, *all true, all agreeable to the word of God, then what are we to think of his other works?* They must be an adulteration of man's devising," (p. 128.) The same may be said of the Minutes: if these be truly orthodox, *upwards of forty volumes* of the Library must be thoroughly heterodox. And then there is great reason to lament, that so many poor people's pockets should be fleeced for what can do their souls no good."

Peremptory enough! But let us examine the matter more closely. "Mr. W. affirms, that the Christian Library is *all true, all agreeable to the word of God.*" I do not; and I am glad I have this public opportunity, of explaining myself concerning it. My words are, (Preface, p. 4,) "I have made, as I was able, an attempt of this kind. I have endeavoured to extract such a collection of English divinity, as *I believe*, is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God." I did believe, and I do believe, *every tract* therein to be true, and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this, (as Mr. H. asserts,) of every sentence contained in the fifty volumes. I could not possibly affirm it for two reasons, 1. I was obliged to prepare most of those

tracts for the press just as I could snatch time in travelling, not transcribing them; (none expected it of me,) but only marking the lines with my pen, and altering or adding a few words here and there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As it was not in my power to attend the press, that care necessarily devolved on others; through whose inattention a hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched out: yet not so many as to make up "forty volumes," no, nor forty pages. It is probable too, I myself might overlook some sentences, which were not suitable to my own principles. It is certain, the correctors of the press did this, in not a few instances. I shall be much obliged to Mr. H. and his friends, if they will point out all those instances; and I will print them as an *Index Expurgatorius* to the work, which will make it doubly valuable.

The plain inference is, if there are a hundred passages in the Christian Library, which contradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proof that I contradict myself. Be it observed, once for all therefore, citations from the Christian Library, prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors.

II.

For election and perseverance.	Against election and perseverance. (p. 101.)

2. Mr. Sellon has clearly shewed, that the 17th article does not assert *absolute predestination*. Therefore in denying this, I neither contradict that article, nor myself.

3. I believe there is a state attainable in this life, from which a man *cannot finally fall.*	But I never thought a babe in Christ was in that state, though he is a true believer.
4. Saved *beyond the dread of falling.*	So says my brother. That is nothing to me.

The note adds, "Mr. W. drew lots, whether or not he should preach against the 17th article."

"That paltry story is untrue. Though Mr. H. potently believes it. So all the witticisms built upon it, fall to the ground at once. I never preached against the 17th article,

nor had the least thought of doing it. But did Mr. Hill never preach against the 31st article, which explicitly asserts universal redemption?

5. I do not deny, that those eminently styled *the elect*, shall infallibly persevere.	I mean, those that are *perfected in love*, (1 John iv. 17,) and those only. So here is no contradiction.
6. The love divine, Which made us thine, Shall keep us thine for ever.	So my brother speaks. But his words cannot prove that *I* contradict *myself*.
7. From all eternity with love. *Unchangeable* thou hast me view'd.	I believe this is true on the supposition of *faith foreseen*, not otherwise.
8. Never again will he take him away.	They are my brother's words, not mine.
9. Jesus the lover of his own, will love me to the end.	So are these.
10. Christ is in *the elect world* of his church.	This is cited from the *Christian Library*. So it goes for nothing.

The nine witnesses therefore examined on this head, prove just nothing at all. So that hitherto there is not the least proof, that I contradict myself.

III.

For imputed righteousness.	Against imputed righteousness.
11. We no more *deny the phrase* (of imputed righteousness) than the thing.	Do not dispute for that particular *phrase*. Here is no contradiction. I do not deny it; yet I dare not *dispute* for it.
12. *This doctrine* I have believed and taught, for near eight and twenty years.	The use of *that term* has done immense hurt. It has: but here is no contradiction.

13. This is a citation from the *Christian Library*. So it goes for nothing.

14. I continually affirm, that the righteousness of Christ (in the sense there explained) is imputed to every believer.	Where is the use of *contending so strenuously for those expressions?* I ask it again. But where is the contradiction?

15. This is another citation from the *Christian Library*. So it proves nothing.

16. The wedding garment is Christ's righteousness, first imputed, and then implanted.	The wedding garment is holiness.—This does not exclude, but presupposes the other.
17. This is consistent with our being justified through the imputation of Christ's righteousness.	John Goodwin contradicts this. Perhaps so. But John Goodwin is not John Wesley.

Whatever therefore he says, (observe it once for all!) does not prove, that I contradict *myself*. I am no way engaged, to defend *every expression* of either John Goodwin or Richard Baxter's Aphorisms. The *sense* of both I generally approve, the *language* many times I do not.

But I observe here, and in fifty other instances, Mr. H. mentions no page. Now (in controversy) he that names no page, has no right to any answer.

18. I frequently put this expression *into the mouth of a whole congregation:* that is, I sing a hymn wherein it occurs.	I dare not *require any to use it.*—True; but here is no contradiction. I do not *require any to use it.* Every one in the congregation may use or let it alone.

Here comes in a thundering note. "Although most of these extracts from Mr. W.'s sermon on Jer. xxiii. 6, have a very evangelical appearance, yet all *their excellency vanisheth away*, when we are told in the same sermon, that the righteousness he contends for, is not the divine righteousness of Christ, but his human righteousness. When we consider the express words of the text, *The Lord our Righteousness*, one might wonder (if any thing is to be wondered at that Mr. W. affirms) how he could possibly fall into an error, which at once not only destroys the meri-

torious efficacy of the Redeemer's righteousness, but undermines the virtue of his atoning blood." This is home: Mr. H. has broken my head sadly. But he will soon give me a plaister: "However, if Mr. W. will acknowledge, that by Christ's human righteousness he means that mediatorial righteousness which was wrought by God in the human nature, I entirely acquiesce with him on the point." This is truly marvellous! Why what could Mr. W. mean beside? So this error proves to be no error at all! And *all the excellency* which *vanished away*, appears again *in statu quo!*

But we are not come to the end of the note yet, it contains another dreadful objection. "Mr. W. is unwilling" (truly I am) "to be ranked among the *Diabolonians*, and therefore with more prudence than candor, has left the whole passage concerning the *Election-doubters*, out of the Holy War." And if Mr. H. had omitted it too, it would have been no more an impeachment of his prudence, than it was of my candor, to omit in all the tracts I abridged, whatever I disapproved of. This was what I professed at my setting out. "I have endeavoured" (these are my very words) "to preserve a consistency throughout, that no part might contradict any other. But in order to this, I have been obliged to omit the far greatest part of several authors. —And in a design of this nature I apprehend myself to be at full liberty so to do," (Preface, p. 5.) The *abridged* Bunyan is not therefore "the *counterfeit* Bunyan." This is a flourish of Mr. H.'s pen.

19. This instance sets nothing against nothing, the *Christian Library against John Goodwin.*

20. This is an emblem of the righteousness of the saints, both of their justification and sanctification.	John Goodwin contradicts this. So he may: but I am not John Goodwin. So we have examined twenty witnesses; and not one of all these proves, that I contradict myself.

21. I would address myself to you, who are so ready to condemn all that use *these expressions, as Antinomians.*

On Mr. Hervey's using one of them, Mr. W. says, Why are you at such pains to increase the number of Antinomians?

But I do not *condemn him as an Antinomian.* Therefore here is no contradiction.

22. Again. Is not this, that *Christ has satisfied the demands of the* law, the very quintessence of *Antinomianism?*

Whether it is or not, it is wide of the mark: for this is none of the expressions in question.

23. Again. To say *the claims of the law are all answered,* is not this Antinomianism without a mask?

Yes; but it is none of the *expressions in question.* So it is no contradiction.

24. Once more. There are many expressions in this dialogue, which directly lead to Antinomianism?

So I think. Yet I do not *condemn all that use them, as Antinomians.* So here is no contradiction still.

25. It is by faith we build on this foundation, the imputed righteousness of Christ.

If faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ is a *fundamental* principle, what becomes of all those who think nothing about imputed righteousness?

Here is no contradiction. Suppose I build my faith on this *foundation,* the imputed righteousness of Christ, it does not follow, it is so fundamental a principle, that all who think nothing about it, will be damned.

26. But is not a believer clothed with the righteousness of Christ? Undoubtedly he is.

Goodwin, i. e. Nothing.

27. The mantle of Christ's righteousness. Christian Library.	Goodwin again. Nothing against Nothing.
28. Christian Library.	Nothing.
29. The sole cause of our acceptance with God is the righteousness, and the death of Christ, who *fulfilled God's law*, and died in our stead.	I cannot prove, that it was requisite for Christ to *fulfil the moral law*, in order to his purchasing redemption for us. By his sufferings alone the law was satisfied.

Undoubtedly it was. Therefore, although I believe *Christ fulfilled God's law*, yet I do not affirm he did this, to *purchase redemption* for us. This was done by his dying in our stead.

30. Verses of C. W.	Let him answer.
31, 32, 33. Title to Life. Christian Library. Nothing.	John Goodwin. Nothing.
34. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to every one that believes.	Ditto.

Here follows another thundering note: "When Mr. Wesley preached this sermon, he told the congregation, *It was the same doctrine which Mr. Romaine, Mr. Madan, and Mr. Whitefield*, preached." So it was; Mr. Wh. did, Mr. R. and Mr. Madan do preach the doctrine contained in that sermon, namely, that "we are justified, sanctified, and glorified, merely for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered for us." But did I say, this was all the doctrine which they preached? No; and no man in his senses could understand me so. I did not therefore "impose on the credulity of my hearers, by making them believe" any more than was strictly true. But "did they ever hold the tenets pleaded for in the books published by Mr. W.?" Whether they did or not, is out of the present question: they did and do hold the doctrine contained in that sermon. "Mr. W. knows, they from their hearts subscribe to Mr. Hervey's eleven letters." I hope not: from any that do, I expect no more mercy than from a mad dog. "But if he had constantly preached that doctrine, how came so many to testify their surprise at that discourse?" Because God

set it home upon their hearts. Hence it appeared new, though they had heard it over and over. "How came they to press the printing of it, in order to stop the mouths of gainsayers?" Because they judged it would affect others as it affected them; though I never thought it would. "Lastly, if Mr. W. had constantly maintained this doctrine, why must poor John Bunyan be embowelled, to make him look like Mr. W.?" No: his Calvinism is omitted, to make him like the authors going before him; "to preserve a consistency throughout the work:" which still is not done as I could wish. However, those that are fond of his bowels may put them in again, and swallow them as they would the trail of a woodcock.

35. They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed, (I mean, who truly believe,) are made righteous by the Spirit of Christ.	The nice, metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteousness, instead of furthering men in holiness, makes them satisfied without any holiness at all.

I have known a thousand instances of this. And yet "they who truly believe in Christ are made righteous by his Spirit." Where is the contradiction between these propositions?

36. Christian Library.	Nothing.
37. Christ is now the righteousness of all that truly believe.	Baxter's Aphorisms go for nothing. Richard Baxter is not J. W.
38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43. } Nothing against	Nothing.
44. To all believers the righteousness of Christ is imputed.	Goodwin. Nothing.

We have now examined four and forty witnesses: but still have no proof, that I contradict myself, either with regard to the *covenant*, *election*, and *perseverance*, *or* the *imputed righteousness of Christ*. With regard to this, the thing that we are justified merely for the sake of what Christ has *done* and *suffered*, I have constantly and earnestly

maintained, above four and thirty years. And I have frequently used the *phrase*, hoping thereby to *please* others, *for their good to edification*. But it has had a contrary effect, since so many improve it into an objection. Therefore I will use it no more, unless it occur in a hymn, or steal upon me unawares: I will endeavour to use only such phrases as are *strictly scriptural*. And I will advise all my brethren, all who are in connexion with me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay aside that ambiguous, unscriptural phrase, which is so liable to be misinterpreted, and to speak in all instances, this in particular, *as the oracles of God*.

IV.

Suffering the penalty is not all the law requires. 45. So says the Christian Library.	Suffering the penalty is all the law requires, (p. 132.) So says John Goodwin.

But this does not prove that I contradict myself.

St. Paul speaks of the law as a person. 46. The law is here spoken of as a *person, to which* as to a husband, *life and death are ascribed*.	St. Paul does not speak of the law as a person, (p. 138.) This way of speaking of the law *as a person injured and to be satisfied*, seems hardly defensible.

There is no contradiction here. I do affirm, St. Paul speaks of the law, "as a person to which as an husband, life and death are ascribed." But I deny, that he speaks of it "as a person injured and to be satisfied."

VI.

For a two-fold justification. 47. Mr. F. affirms justification is two-fold.	Against a two-fold justification. The justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our Articles, is one and no more, (p. 133.)

Most true. And yet our Lord (Matt. xii. 37.) speaks of another justification. Now I think one and one make two.

VII.

For a justified state.	Against a justified state, (p. 139.)
48. The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious.	Does not talking of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men? It frequently does. But where is the contradiction?

VIII.

They who are once justified are justified for ever.	They who are justified, may become total apostates.
49. *Christian Library.* Nothing.	

IX.

Works are a condition of justification, (p. 134.)	Works are not a condition of justification.
50. *Salvation* (i. e. glory) is not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.	I believe no good works can be previous to *justification;* nor consequently a condition of it.
This proposition does not speak of justification. So it is nothing to the purpose.	51. If a man could be holy, before he was justified, it would set his justification aside.
Whoever desires to find favour with God, should *cease from evil and learn to do well.* Whoever repents should do *works meet for repentance.* And if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for.	52. Thou canst do nothing but sin, till thou art justified. 53. We allow, that God justifies the ungodly, him that to that hour is full of all evil, void of all good; and him that worketh not, till that moment worketh no goodness.

All this I believe still. "But Mr. W. says, whoever desires to find favour wtth God should *cease from evil and learn to do well,*" &c. Does not the Bible, say so? Who can deny it? Nay but Mr. W. asks, "If this be not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?" And I ask it again. Let Mr. H. or any one else, give me an answer. So if there

is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict myself, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul.

X.

Against justification by the act of believing.	For justification by the act of believing.
54. But do not you put faith in the room of Christ, and his righteousness? No: I take particular care to *put each of these in its proper place.*	The faith which is said to be imputed to Abraham for righteousness, is faith properly taken; and not the righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith.

This is *putting each of these in its proper place.* The righteousness of Christ is the *meritorious cause* of our justification. That is its proper place. Faith in him that gave himself for us, is the condition of justification. That is its proper place.

I am justified through the righteousness of Christ as the *price;* through faith as the *condition.* I do not say, neither does Goodwin, faith is that, *for* which we were accepted. But we both say, faith is that thro' which we are accepted. We are justified, we are accepted of God, *for the sake of Christ,* through faith. Now certainly there is no contradiction in this; unless a contradiction to Mr. H.'s notions.

55. Although we have faith, hope, and love, yet we must renounce the *merit* of all, as far too weak to *deserve* our justification; for which we must trust only to the *merits* of Christ.	That which is the *condition* of justification, is not the righteousness of Christ. Most true: otherwise we confound the *condition* with the meritorious *cause* spoken of in the opposite column.

XI.

Justification by faith alone is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ.* All who do not hold it must perish everlastlastingly.	Justification by faith alone is not *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ.* Some may doubt of it, yea, deny it, and yet not perish everlastingly, (p. 127.)
56. Of this may be affirmed, (what Luther affirms of	A pious churchman who

justification by faith,) that it is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, the pillar of that faith of which alone cometh salvation; that faith which unless a man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.	has not *clear conceptions of* justification by faith, may be saved; yea, a mystic, (Mr. Law, for instance,) who denies justification by faith. If so, the doctrine of justification by faith, is not *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ.*

It is certain here is a *seeming* contradiction: but it is not a *real* one. For these two opposite propositions, do not speak of *the same thing*. The latter speaks of *justification by faith:* the former, of *trusting in the righteousness* or *merits of Christ:* (justification by faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now although Mr. Law denied justification by faith, he might *trust in the merits of Christ*. It is this, and this only that I affirm, (whatever Luther does,) to be *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ.*

XII.

Mr. W. is a *Calvinist* in the point of justification.	Mr. W. has leaned too much toward *Calvinism* in this point.
57. I think *on justification* just as I have done these seven and twenty years, and just as Calvin does.	We have leaned too much toward Calvinism, (p. 141.) But not *in this point:* not as to justification by faith.

We still agree with him, that the merits of Christ are the *cause*, faith the *condition* of justification.

58. I have occasionally used those expressions, *imputed righteousness*, the *righteousness of Christ*, and the like. But I never used them in any other sense than that wherein Calvin does.	Goodwin. Nothing.
59. Mr. W. does approve the expression *why me?* My brother uses it in a hymn.	Mr. W. does not approve the expression *why me?* Mr. F. says, Mr. W. doubts concerning it, (p. 140.)

This proof halts on both feet. "But why did not Mr. W. strike out of Mr. F.'s manuscript, the honourable ex-

pressions concerning himself?" Because he thought them a proper counter-balance to the contumelious expressions of Mr. H.

XIV.

Our sin is imputed to Christ, and Christ's righteousness to us.	Our sin is not imputed to Christ, nor Christ's righteousness to us, (p. 140.)
60. } *Christian Library.*	
61. } Nothing.	

XV.

62. Both Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness are imputed, (p. 131.)	Neither Adam's sin nor Christ's righteousness is imputed.

63. Nothing against nothing.

In what sense I believe the Christian Library to be *all true*, I have declared above.

XVI.

Mr. W. holds free-will.	Mr. W. wonders how any man can hold free-will.
64. Mr. F. holds free-will.	Mr. W. denies it.

This may prove, that Mr. W. contradicts Mr. F. but it can never prove that he contradicts himself. But indeed both Mr. F. and Mr. W. absolutely deny *natural* free-will. We both steadily assert, that the will of man is *by nature* free only to evil. Yet we both believe, that every man has a measure of free-will restored to him *by grace*.

XVII.

For the doctrine of Merit.	Against the doctrine of Merit.
65. "We are rewarded according to our works, yea, because of our works. How does this differ from, for the sake of our works? And how differs this from *Secundum merita operum*, or as our works *deserve?* Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot."—I say so still. Let Mr. H. if he can.	And yet I still maintain, "There is no *merit*, taking the word strictly, but in the blood of Christ: that salvation is not by the *merit* of works. And that there is nothing we are, or have, or do, which can, strictly speaking, *deserve* the least thing at God's hand."

And all this is no more than to say, Take the word *merit* in a *strict* sense, and I utterly renounce it. Take it in a *looser* sense, and though I never use it, yet I do not condemn it. Therefore with regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict myself at all.

XVIII.

For a single life.	Against a single life.
66. Mr. W. says, his thoughts on a single life, are just the same they have been these thirty years, (p. 136.)	Why then did Mr. W. marry?—For reasons best known to himself.
67. He advises, that we should pray against marriage.	I advise single persons to pray, "That they may prize the advantages they enjoy."

Be this right or wrong, still here is no contradiction.

XIX.

For gay apparel.	Against gay apparel.
68. To *make it a point of conscience*, to differ from others, (as the Quakers do,) in the *shape* or *colour* of their apparel, is mere superstition.	Let a single intention to please God prescribe both what clothing you should buy, and the manner wherein it shall be made. *ibid.*—This I stand to.
	Wear nothing of a *glaring colour*, or made in the very *height* of the fashion.

So I *advise:* but I do not *make it a point of conscience.* So here is no contradiction still.

XX.

Against tea.	For tea.
69. Mr. W. published a tract against drinking tea, and told the tea-drinkers, he would set them an example in that piece of self-denial.	I did set them an example for twelve years. Then at the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, I used it again.

But must not a man be sadly in want of argument, who stoops so low as this?

XXI.

For baptism by sprinkling.	Against baptism by sprinkling.
70. As there is no clear	When Mr. W. baptized

proof of *dipping* in Scripture, so there is very probable proof to the contrary.

71. Christ no where, as far as I can find, requires *dipping*, but only *baptizing*; which word signifies to *pour on*, or *sprinkle*, as well as to *dip*.

Mrs. L. S. he held her so long under water, that her friends screamed out, thinking she had been drowned.

When? Where? I never heard of it before.

Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by immersion, *unless the parents certified they were weak?*

Not because I had any scruple, but in obedience to the rubric. So here is no self-inconsistency.

XXII.

Mr. W. never adopted Mr. Law's scheme.

Mr. W. highly approved of Mr. Law.

These propositions are not contradictory. I might *highly approve* of him, and yet not *adopt his scheme*. How will Mr. H. prove that I did? Or that I contradict myself on this head? Why thus:

72. I had been eight years at Oxford, before I read any of Mr. Law's writings. And when I did, I was so far from making them my creed, that I had objections, to almost every page, p. 135.

To instruct a person in the nature of Christianity, I fixed an hour a day, to read with her in Mr. Law's treatise on Christian Perfection. I did so. And an excellent book it is, though liable to many objections.

73. Another little company of us met: we sung, read a little of Mr. Law, and then conversed.

True; but neither does this prove that I *adopted his scheme*.

73. I believe the *mystic* writers, to be one great Antichrist.

74. Mr. F. affirms, Solomon is the chief of *mystics*: and Mr. W. acquiesces in the affirmation.

I retract this. It is far too strong. But observe! I never *contradicted it* till now.

I do not. I affirm no such thing. Therefore all Mr. H. builds upon this, is only a castle in the air.

XXIII.

Enoch and Elijah are in heaven.	Enoch and Elijah are not in heaven.
75. Enoch and Elijah entered at once into the highest degree of glory.	Enoch and Elijah are not in heaven, but only in paradise, (p. 138.)

Notes on the New Testament, John iii. 13. first edition.

But why is Mr. H. so careful to name the first edition? Because in the second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And could he avail himself of a mistake, which he knew was removed before he wrote!

XXIV.

For sinless perfection.	Against sinless perfection.

Upon this head Mr. H. employs his whole strength. I will, therefore, the more carefully weigh what he advances: only premising, before I descend to particulars, two general observations.

1. Out of the twenty-five passages cited for *perfection*, seventeen are taken from my brother's hymns. These, therefore, strike wide. Whatever they prove, they cannot prove, that *I* contradict *myself*.

2. Out of the twenty-five cited against perfection, fourteen are cited from the sermon on *sin in believers*. Do I mean, in such *believers* as are *perfected in love?* Mr. H. himself knows I do not. Why then every one of these fourteen arguments, is an abuse both upon me and his readers. It is the most egregious trifling that can be conceived. I affirm, "Those perfected in love, are saved from inward sin." To prove I contradict myself herein, fourteen passages are alleged, wherein I affirm, "We are not saved from inward sin, *till* we are perfected in love!"

3. The same fallacy is used in every instance, when some of my words are set in opposition to others. The sum is, weak *believers*, babes in Christ, are not; *adult believers*, are saved from inward sin. And I still aver, there is no contradiction in this, if I know what a contradiction means.

Now to the proofs.

76. The Son hath made them, who are *thus born of God*, free from *pride*.	*They* are sensible of *pride* remaining in their hearts.

They? Who? Not those who are *thus born of God*, who are *perfected in love*.

77. From the iniquity of *pride* and *self*, I shall be free. That is, when I am *perfected in love*.	God's children are daily sensible of *pride* and *self-will*. That is, till they are *perfected in love*.
78. They are freed from *wanderings* in prayer.	Is this spoken of *all believers?* Mr. H. knows it is not.
79. Christians are saved from *all sin*, from *all unrighteousness*.	True, *adult Christians*.
80. They (adult Christians) are freed from all *evil thoughts* and *evil tempers*.	The (infant) children of God have in them *sin of every kind*.
81. They (fathers in Christ) are freed from evil thoughts.	The evil nature opposes the Spirit even in believers—till they are fathers in Christ.
82. Christ was free from sinful thoughts. So are they likewise *(adult believers.)*	This doctrine (that *all* believers are thus free) is wholly new.
83. I believe, some would say, "We trust we do keep *the whole law of love*."	Believers are conscious of not fulfilling the whole law of love: not till they are *perfected in love*.

The reader will please to remember all along, the question is not, Whether the doctrine be right or wrong: (that has been elsewhere considered) but whether I contradict myself. Upwards of fourscore witnesses have been already examined on this head: but no contradiction is proved yet.

84. Some do love God with *all their heart and strength*.	They (weak believers) do not love God with *all their heart and strength*.
85. *From that hour*, indwelling sin, thou hast no place in me.	Believers are not delivered from the being of sin *till that hour*.
86. A sinless life we live.	Christian Library, nothing.
87. While *one evil thought* can rise, I am not born again.	My brother said so once: I never did.

In the note annexed, there are many mistakes. 1. "The

author of this hymn did not allow any one to be a believer, even *in the lowest sense*, while he found the least stirring of sin." He did: but he took the word *born again* in too high a sense. 2. Yet "he supposes *the most advanced believers* are deeply sensible of their impurity." He does not: neither he nor I suppose any such thing. 3. "He tells us in his note on Eph. vi. 13, *The war is perpetual.*" True: the war *with principalities and powers;* but not that *with flesh and blood.* 4. So you cannot reply, "Mr. W. *speaks* of believers of *different stature.*" Indeed I can: and the forgetting this is the main cause of Mr. H.'s stumbling at every step. 5. "The position, that (any) believers are totally free from sin, is diametrically opposite to Calvinism." This is no mistake. Therefore most Calvinists hate it with a perfect hatred. 6. "Many of the grossest of these contradictions, were published nearly at the same time: and *probably* Mr. W. was the same day correcting the press, both for and against Sinless Perfection." An ingenious thought! But as to the truth, or even *probability* of it, I cannot say much. 7. "These hymns contain the joint sentiments of Mr. John and Mr. Charles Wesley." Not always: so that if *some* of them contradict others, it does not prove, that I contradict myself.

88. Christ in a *pure and sinless* heart,	There are still two contrary principles in believers, nature and grace. True, till they are perfect in love.
89. Quite expel the *carnal mind.*	That there is no sin in a (weak) believer, no *carnal mind*, is contrary to the word of God.
90. From *every evil motion freed.*	How naturally do men think, sin has *no motion;* therefore it has *no being.*

But how does this prove, that I contradict myself?

91. *All the struggle* then is o'er.	These are two of my brother's expressions, which I do not subscribe to.
92. I *wrestle not* now.	
93. God is thine: disdain to fear *the enemy within.*	Let us watch and pray against *the enemy within,*

Are these lines cited as implying, the enemy *was not within?* Most unhappily. They mean, the enemy *which is within.* For the very next words, which Mr. H. himself cited but a page before, are,

God *shall* in thy flesh appear,
And make an end of sin.

94. We *wrestle not with flesh and blood*, when we are grown up in Christ.	We *wrestle both* with *flesh and blood*, and with principalities; while we are babes in Christ.
No contradiction yet.	
95. Sin *shall not in* our flesh remain.	Still he (the babe in Christ) feels the remains of the old man.
96. I cannot rest if *sin in me remains.*	Sin remains in them still. In all weak believers.
97. 98. 99. My Brother's.	
100. "Do not the best of men say, *We groan, being burden'd* with the workings of inbred corruption?" This is not the meaning of the text; the whole context shews, the cause of that groaning was, their longing to be with Christ.	We groan, being burdened with numberless infirmities, temptations, and sins. —This is wrong. It is not the meaning of the text. I will put it out, if I live to print another edition. So just one shot in a hundred has hit the mark.
101. Nor does he that is born of God sin by *infirmities:* for his infirmities have no concurrence of his will. And without this, they are *not properly sins.*—That is, they are not voluntary transgressions of a known law.	Many infirmities remain, whereby we are daily subject to what are called *sins of infirmity.* And they are in some sense sins; as being (involuntary) transgressions of the perfect law.

I see no contradiction here: but if there was, it ought not to have been mentioned. It could not by any generous writer; since Mr. Hill himself testifies, it was expunged before he mentioned it! But suppose it stood as at first, I flatly deny, that it is any contradiction at all. These infirmities may be in *some sense* sins; and yet not properly

so: that is, sins in an improper, but not the *proper, sense* of the word.

13. But "Mr. W. has not yet determined, whether *sins of surprise* bring the soul under condemnation or not, (p. 111.) However, it were to be wished, that *sins of surprise and sins of infirmity* too were to be declared mortal at the next conference; since several persons who pretend to reverence Mr. W. not only fall into *outrageous passions*, but cozen and over-reach their neighbours: and call these things *little, innocent infirmities*. Reader, weigh well those words of Mr. W. 'We cannot say, either that men are or are not condemned for sins of surprise.' And yet immediately before he calls them, *transgressions*, as here he calls them sins. *Strange divinity* this, for one who for near forty years past has professed to believe and teach that 'sin is the transgression of the law, and' that 'the wages of sin is death.'" He then brings three instances of sins of surprise, (over and above *cozening and over-reaching,) drunkenness, fornication*, and flying into a *passion and knocking a man down:* and concludes, "Mr. W. had better sleep quietly, than rise from his own pillow in order to lull his hearers asleep, upon the pillow of false security, by speaking in so slight a manner of sin, and making the breach of God's holy law a mere nothing."

14. This is a charge indeed! And it is perfectly new: I believe it was never advanced before. It will not therefore be improper to give it a thorough examination. It is founded on some passages in the sermon on Rom. viii. 1, "There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." In order to give a clear view of the doctrine therein delivered, I must extract the sum of the sermon.

I shew, 1. Who are "those that are in Christ Jesus:" "Those who are joined to the Lord in one spirit, who dwell in Christ and Christ in them. And 'whosoever abideth in him sinneth not, walketh not after the flesh,' that is, corrupt nature. These abstain from every design, and

word, and work, to which the corruption of nature leads, (p. 145.) They 'walk after the Spirit' both in their hearts and lives. By him they are led into every holy desire, into every divine and heavenly temper, till every thought of their heart is 'holiness to the Lord.'

"They are also led by him into all holinesss of conversation. They exercise themselves day and night, to do only the things which please God: in all their outward behaviour, to follow him 'who left us an example that we might tread in his steps:' in all their intercourse with their neighbour, to walk in justice, mercy, and truth: and whatsoever they do in every circumstance of life, to 'do all to the glory of God,'" (p. 246.)

Is here any room for "cozening and over-reaching?" For "flying into outrageous passions?" Does this give any countenance, for "knocking men down?" For "drunkenness, or fornication?"

But let us go on to the second head. "To whom is there no condemnation? To believers in Christ who *thus walk after the Spirit*, there is no condemnation for their past sins, (p. 127.) Neither for present, for now transgressing the commandments of God: for they do not transgress them. *This is the proof of their love of God, that they keep his commandments*, (p. 148.) They are not condemned, 3. for inward sin, so long as they do not yield thereto; so long as they *maintain a continual war with all sin*, with pride, anger, desire, so that the flesh hath no dominion over them, but they still walk after the Spirit," (p. 150.) Is any encouragement given here to cozeners or whoremongers?

It follows, "They are not condemned for sins of infirmity, as they are usually called. Perhaps it were advisable rather to call them *infirmities*, that we may not seem to *give any countenance* to sin, or to extenuate it in any degree, by thus coupling it with infirmity. But (if we must use such an *ambiguous and dangerous* expression) by *sins of infirmity* I would mean, such involuntary failings, as the saying a thing we believe true, though in fact it prove to be false;

or the hurting our neighbour, without knowing or designing it; perhaps when we designed to do him good," (p. 151.)

What pretence has Mr. H. from these words to flourish away upon my "*strange divinity?*" And to represent me giving men a handle, to term gross sins *innocent infirmities?*

But now comes the main point. "It is more difficult to determine concerning those which are usually styled *sins of surprise*, (p. 152.) As when one who commonly in his patience possesses his soul, on a sudden or violent temptation, speaks or acts in a manner not consistent with the royal law of love." (For instance. You have the gout. A careless man treads on your foot. You violently push him away, and it may be cry out, "Get away: get you out of my sight.") "Perhaps it is not easy, to fix a general rule concerning transgressions of this nature. We cannot say either that men are, or that they are not condemned, *for sins of surprise in general*," (p. 153.)

"Reader," says Mr. H. "let me beg thee to weigh well the foregoing words." I say so too. I go on. "But it seems, whenever a believer is overtaken in a fault, there is more or less condemnation, as there is more or less concurrence of his will.—Therefore some sins of surprise bring much guilt and condemnation. For in some instances our being surprised may be owing to some culpable neglect, or to a sleepiness of soul, which might have been prevented or shaken off, before the temptation came. The falling even by surprise in such an instance exposes the sinner to condemnation, both from God and his own conscience.

"On the other hand, there may be sudden assaults, which he hardly could foresee, by which he may be borne down, suppose into a degree of anger, or thinking evil of another, with scarcely any concurrence of the will. Now in such a case the jealous God would undoubtedly shew him, that he had done foolishly. He would be convinced of having swerved from the perfect law, and consequently *grieved* with a godly sorrow, and lovingly *ashamed* before God. Yet need he not come into condemnation. In the

midst of that sorrow and shame, he can still say, 'The Lord is my strength and my song: he is also become my salvation,'" (p. 154.)

Now what can any impartial person think of Mr. H.'s eloquence on this head? What a representation has he given of my doctrine, with regard to infirmities and sins of surprise? Was ever any thing more unjust? Was ever any thing more cruel? Do I here "lull my readers asleep on the *pillow* of false security?" Do I "speak *in a light manner* of sin?" Or "make the breach of God's holy law a *mere nothing?*" What excuse can be made for pouring out all this flood of calumny? Can any thing be termed "bearing false witness against our neighbour," if this is not? Am I indeed a loose casuist? Do any of my writings give countenance to sin? Not so: God knows, Mr. Hill knows, Mr. Romaine (who corrected this tract) knows it well. So does Mr. Madan: yea, so do all who read what I write, unless they wilfully shut their eyes.

15. "Thus have I at length," says Mr. H. "brought this extraordinary *farrago* to a conclusion. Not because I could not have found many more inconsistencies," (p. 142.) Yes, another hundred, such as these. But see a group of them at once! "His extract from bishop Beveridge, is flatly contradicted in his edition of John Goodwin. Again, Goodwin is flatly contradicted, by his sermon on 'The Lord our Righteousness.' This sermon is contradicted in his 'Preservative against unsettled Notions in Religion.' This Preservative is itself contradicted, by his Abstract from Dr. Preston. This Abstract is itself contradicted by his edition of Baxter's Aphorisms. And these are flatly contradicted, by his extract from bishop Beveridge. And this is again flatly contradicted by his own 'Thoughts on imputed Righteousness.' Thus the wheel runs round!" Thus Mr. H.'s head runs round, with more haste than good speed. (If this curious paragraph be not rather, as I suspect, supplied by another hand; even as Sternhold's Psalms are now and then eked out by N. N. or William Wisdom.) He forgets, that generals prove nothing; and that he has sadly failed in his

particular charges: just a hundred out of a hundred and one, having proved void. So that now I have full right to say, "Whence arises this charge of self-inconsistency and contradiction? Merely from straining, winding to and fro, and distorting a few innocent words. For wherein have I contradicted myself, taking words in their unforced, natural construction, in any one respect, with regard to justification, since the year 1738?"

17. But Mr. H.'s head is so full of my self-inconsistency, that he still blunders on. "Mr. W.'s wavering disposition is not an affair of yesterday. Mr. Delamotte spake to him *on this head*, more than thirty years ago," (p. 143.) He never spake to me *on this head* at all. Ask him. He is still alive. "He has been tossed from one system to another, from the time of his ordination to the present moment." Nothing can be more false; as not only my Journals, but all my writings testify. "And he himself cannot but acknowledge, that both his friends and foes have accused him of his unsettled principles in religion." Here is artifice! Would any man living, who does not know the fact, suppose that a *gentleman* would face a man down, in so peremptory a manner, unless the thing were absolutely true? And yet it is quite the reverse. "He himself cannot but acknowledge."—I acknowledge no such thing. My friends have oftener accused me of being too stiff in my opinions, than too flexible. My enemies have accused me of both; and of every thing besides. The truth is, from the year 1725, I saw more and more of the nature of inward religion, chiefly by reading the writings of Mr. Law, and a few other *mystic* writers. Yet I never was "in the way of *mysticism*" at all: this is another mistake. Although I did not clearly see, that we *are saved by faith*, till the year 1738; I then published the sermon on *Salvation by Faith*, every sentence of which I subscribe to now.

17. But he was "too scrupulous about using the word *condition*," (p. 143.) I was so, till I was convinced by Dr. Church, that it was a very innocent word, and one that none of the reformers, English or foreign, objected to. All

this time I leaned towards *Calvinism*, though more in expression than sentiment. "And now he fairly gives up the necessity of a *clear belief* of justification by faith alone!" That is, I say, A man may be saved, who is not *clear* in his judgment concerning it. I do: I dare not "rank Mr. Law, and all his admirers, among the hosts of Diabolonians." Nay, more: "I have *proved*, that he makes man's righteousness the *procuring cause* of his acceptance with God, and his *salvation*, from *first to last*, to depend upon the intrinsic *merit* of his own *unassisted* works," (p. 144.) I think Mr. H. "is now got to his *ne plus ultra*:" unless he has a mind to *prove*, that Mr. W. is a horse.

18. "I expect you will tell me, that I have exposed Mr. W. particularly in the foregoing contrast. That Mr. W. is exposed, I allow; but that I have exposed him, I deny." Who was it then? Why, "out of his own mouth all that I have brought against him proceeds."

Not so. All that I have written (except one sentence out of a hundred and one) is well consistent with itself, provided the words be taken in their plain, natural sense, and one part of them in connexion with the other. But whoever will use Mr. H.'s art of twisting and torturing words, may make them say any thing, and extract Pelagianism, Arianism, or any thing he pleases, out of any thing that can be spoken. By this art he that cries out against Mr. F.'s art, has found, that is, created above a hundred contradictions in my works, and "could find abundance more." Ay, five hundred: under his forming hand, contradictions spring up as quick as mushrooms. And he that reads only (as is the manner of a thousand readers) the running title at the top of each page,

For election.	Against election.
For sinless perfection.	Against sinless perfection.
For imputed righteousness	Against imputed righteousness.

And so on, will readily say, "What a heap of contradictions, flat, palpable contradictions, is here!" Here! Where?

"Why, at the top of every page." True; and there lies the strength of the cause. The propositions themselves are plain enough, but neither Mr. H. nor any man living can prove them.

19. But if so, if all this laboured contrast, be only the work of a creative imagination, what has Mr. Hill, the cat's-paw of a party, been doing all this time? Has he not been abundantly *doing evil, that good might come*, that the dear decree of reprobation might stand? Has he not been *saying all manner of evil falsely*, pouring out slander like water, a first, a second, a third time, against one that never willingly offended him? And what recompence can he make (be his opinions right or wrong) for having so deeply injured me, without any regard either to mercy or truth? If he (not myself) has indeed exposed me in so unjust and inhuman a manner, what amends can he make, as a Christian and a gentleman, to God, to me, or to the world? Can he gather up the foul, poisonous water which he has so abundantly poured out? If he still insists, he has done me no wrong, he has only *spoken the truth in love*; if he is resolved at all hazards to fight it out, I will meet him on his own ground. Waving all things else, I fix on this point, "Is that scurrilous hotch-potch, which he calls a *Farrago*, true or false?" Will he defend or retract it? A hundred and one propositions are produced as *mine*, which are affimed to contradict other propositions of *mine*. Do I in these hundred and one instances, *contradict myself*, or do I not? Observe: the question is, whether I contradict *myself?* Not whether I contradict *some body else:* be it Mr. Baxter, Goodwin, Fletcher; the Christian Library; or even my own brother. These are not *myself*. "Nay, but you have published them." If I publish them ten times over, still they are not *myself*. I insist upon it, that no man's words but *my own* can ever prove, that *I* contradict *myself*. Now, if Mr. H. scorns to yield, let him fall to work, and prove by *my own* words, that *I* contradict *myself* (that is the present question) in these hundred instances. If he can prove this, I am a blunderer; I must plead guilty to

the charge. If he cannot, he is one of the most cruel and inhuman slanderers, that ever set pen to paper.

20. I bless God, that the words cited from the sermon on a *Catholic Spirit*, do quite "come to myself:" not indeed as I am *painted* by Mr. H. but as I really am. From the year 1738, I have not been "unsettled as to any fundamental doctrine of the gospel." No, not in one: I am as clear of this charge, as of that wonderful one advanced in the note, (p. 146.) "Though this sermon be intitled, *Catholic Spirit*, yet it inculcates an attendance upon one only congregation: in other words, hear *me*, and *those I send out*, and *no body else*." Mr. H. himself knows better: he knows I advise all of the church, to hear the parish minister. I do not advise, even dissenters of any kind, not to hear their own teachers. But I advise all, do not *heap to yourselves preachers, having itching ears*. Do not run hither and thither to hear every new thing; else you will be established in nothing. "However it is by *stratagems* of this sort, that he holds so many souls in his *shackles*, and prevents them from coming to the knowledge of *all the glorious truths of the gospel*."

Observe, *Gospel* is with Mr. H. the same as *Calvinism*. So where he says, "there is no *gospel*," he means no *predestination*. By the same figure of speech, some of his admirers used to say, "there is *no honey* in the book." Here lies the core: this is the wrong, for which the *bigots* of *this gospel* will never forgive me. And all those are such, who "rank all *election doubters* among *Diabolonians*." Such is Mr. H. a bigot in grain, while he sets his hand to that gentle sentence. Nay, further, says he, "I cannot help informing my readers," (no, if he did, he must burst,) "that in the life of Mr. Philip Henry, published in his Christian Library, he has artfully left out Mr. Henry's Confession of Faith." *Artfully!* No; *honestly*; according to the open profession in the preface cited before.

21. Yet Mr. H. this Mr. H. says to Mr. Fl. "Suffer not *bitter words* and *calumnious expressions* to disguise themselves under the appearance of plainness," (p. 147.) Bitter

words! Can Mr. H. imagine there is any harm in these? Mr. H. that cites *the judicious* Mr. Toplady! That admires the famous *Eleven Letters*, which are *bitterness* double distilled! Which overflow with little else but *calumnious expressions*, from the beginning to the end! Mr. H. that himself wrote the *Review*, and the *Farrago!* And does he complain of Mr. Fletcher's bitterness? Why, *he* may be a little bitter; but not Mr. F. Altering the person alters the thing! "If it was *your* bull that gored *mine*, says the judge in the fable, that is another case!"

22. Two objections to my personal conduct, I have now briefly to consider. 1. "Mr. W. embraced Mr. Shirley as a friend at the Conference, and then directly went out to give the signal for war," (p. 150.) This is partly true. It is true, that although I was not ignorant of his having deeply injured me, yet I freely forgave him at the Conference, and again "embraced him as a friend." But it is not true, that I "directly went out to give the signal for war." "Nay, why else did you consent to the publishing of Mr. F.'s letters?" Because I judged it would be an effectual means of undoing the mischief which Mr. S. had done. Not that I am now sorry (though I was) for what he has done, for his publication of that bitter circular letter. For I now clearly discern the hand of God, throughout that whole affair. Both my brother and I still indulged the fond hope, of living in peace with our *warm Calvinist* brethren: but we now give it up; our eyes are open; we see what we have to expect. We look for neither mercy nor justice at their hands: if we find any, it will be clear gains.

23. The second objection is, "Mr. W. acknowledged the *unguarded* manner in which the Minutes were drawn up: and yet immediately after defended them." I answer, "How did I acknowledge the *unguarded* manner?" The plain case was this. I seek peace, and would do any thing for it, which I can with a safe conscience. On this principle it was, that when Mr. S. read over his declaration, (I say his; for it was he drew it up, not I,) and asked, if we

agreed thereto? I was heartily desirous to agree with him as far as ossible. In order to this, after altering some words, I asked our brethren, if they were willing to sign it? One immediately said, "The Minutes are not *unguarded*; they are guarded enough." I said, They are guarded enough for *you*; but not for those who seek occasion against us. And observe, it is only in *this* sense, that I subscribed to that expression. But I will not affirm, that my love of peace did not carry me a little too far. I know not but it would have been better, not to have signed the paper at all.

24. So much for the Minutes. Perhaps it may be expected, that I should also take some notice of what Mr. H. says concerning Perfection. All his arguments, indeed, and ten times more, I have answered over and over. But if it is required, I will answer once more: only premising, By that *Perfection*, to which St. Paul directs Mr. H. and me to *go on*, Heb. vi. 1, I understand neither more nor less, than what St. John terms *perfect love*, 1 John iv. 18, and our Lord, "Loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength." If you choose to call this *sinful perfection*, (rather than *sinless*) you have my free leave.

Mr. H.'s main argument against this is, that "it is a *popish* doctrine." How does this appear? "O, Luther says so," (p. 25.) This will not do: it is only *second hand* evidence. "It crept into the church first in the fifth century, and has been since almost generally received in the church of Rome," (p. 49.) How is this proved? Either that the doctrine of *perfect love* crept first into the church in the fifth century? Or, that it has been since almost generally received in the church of Rome? Why, "we may very readily perceive this, by the following extract from bishop Cowper." I answer, 1. This is but *second hand* evidence still. 2. It is wide of the mark. For this whole extract says not a word about the church of Rome. It contains only a few citations from St. Augustin and St.

Bernard, foreign to the present question; and one from St. Ambrose, if it be possible, more foreign still. None of these touch either of the points in question, "This doctrine crept into the church in the fifth century:" or, "It has been (ever) since almost generally received in the church of Rome."

Here I must beg leave to put Mr. H. in mind of one stated rule in controversy. We are to take no authorities at *second hand*, but always recur to the originals. Consequently, words of St. Bernard, or twenty saints more, *copied from bishop Cowper*, prove just nothing. Before we can urge the authority of St. Bernard or Ambrose, we must consult the authors themselves, and tell our readers, what edition we use, with the page where the words are found: otherwise they cannot form a judgment either of the fairness of the quotation, or of the sense and weight of it.

Hitherto then we have not one tittle of proof, that this is a *popish* doctrine; that it ever was, or is now, "almost generally received in the church of Rome:" (although if it had, this would be no conclusive argument against it: as neither is it conclusive against the doctrine of the blessed Trinity:) I do not know that it ever was: but this I know; it has been solemnly condemned by the church of Rome. It has been condemned by the Pope and his whole conclave, even in this present century. In the famous bull *Unigenitus*, (so called from the first words, *Unigenitus Dei filius*,) they utterly condemn the *uninterrupted act*, (of faith and love, which some then talked of, of continually *rejoicing*, *praying*, and *giving thanks*,) as *dreadful heresy!* Now in what public act of the church of Rome is the doctrine of Perfection maintained? Till this is produced, I pray let us hear no more that Perfection is a *popish* doctrine.

25. However, "the distinction between *sins* and innocent *infirmities* is derived from the Romish church," (p. 56.) How does this appear? Thus. "Two of her devoted champions, Lindenus and Andradius, distinguish between

infirmities and sins." Lindenus and Andradius! Who are they? From what country did they come? I do not know the men. One of them, for ought I know, might serve as an interpreter at the council of Trent. What then? Was he an authorized interpreter of the doctrines of the church? Nay, and how do you know, that they did speak of *little trifling faults*, or of *minute and trivial sins?* Did you ever read them? Pray what edition of their works do you use? And in what page do these words occur? Till we know this, that there may be an opportunity of examining the books, (though I fear scarcely worth examining) it is doing too much honour to *such quotations*, to take any notice of them at all.

26. Well, now for the buskins! Now *Spiral tragicum satis!* "And this is the doctrine which is preached to more than thirty thousand souls, of which Mr. W. has the charge." Then I am sure it is high time, that not only the Calvinist ministers, but "all that wish well to the interest of protestantism," (so Mr. S. said before,) "should *in a body protest* against such licentious tenets." *Blow ye the trumpet in Sion!* Gird on your armour! Make ye yourselves ready for battle! Again the trumpet sounds: a crusade! A holy war! Down with the heretics! But hold! what spirit are you of? Are you followers of peace? Then *bring forth your strong reasons: speak the truth in love*, and we are ready to meet you. But really all this talk of *my* licentious doctrine, is a mere copy of Mr. H.'s countenance. *He* knows, and all in England know, (whoever have heard my name,) that it is not *too loose*, but *too strict* doctrine I am constantly accused of. Therefore all this bluster, about "my superseding the law," has not only no truth, but no colour, no plausibility. And when Mr. H. calls so gravely for Dr. Crisp, to "sweep away all my Antinomian rubbish," shall we laugh or weep?

Cuivis facilis rigidi censura cachinni

Rather let us drop a tear on human infirmity.

27. So much for the first grand argument against Perfection, That it is generally received in the church of Rome. The second is, "It was generally received among the ranting Anabaptists in Germany," (p. 49.) What author of note testifies this? I allow no *second hand* authority; but desire to know what German historian of credit has recorded it? And in what page of his works? When this is ascertained, then we may observe, it proves just nothing.

A third argument against Perfection is, that "it was maintained by many wild ranters in London." Wild enough! Although no stress is to be laid on Mr. H.'s informations concerning them; some of which are altogether false, and the rest imperfect enough. But suppose they were all true, what would follow? Many hearers abusing the doctrines I teach, no more prove that those doctrines are false, than the German ranters proved that Luther's were so.

28. Is it another *argument*, that "the monstrous doctrine of Perfection turns some of its deluded votaries into monsters? (p. 44.) This may be proved from the cases of Bell and Harris; the former of whom prophesied, that the world would be at an end the last of February: the latter was seized with raging madness, and died blaspheming in a most dreadful manner."

It would be strange, if George Bell were not brought upon the stage, as he has been a hundred times over. As for poor Benjamin Harris, I believe, as a punishment for his pride and uncharitableness, God permitted him to be struck in an instant with diabolical madness. But it did not continue to his death; he did not die blaspheming. I saw him myself quiet and composed: and he calmly delivered up his soul to God.

See another instance. "A friend of mine lately informed me, that an eminent preacher of Perfection told him, that he had not sinned for some years, and that the Holy Ghost had descended and sat on him and many others

in a visible manner, as he did upon the apostles in the day of Pentecost." Please to name the man: otherwise a hundred such tales will weigh nothing with men of sense and candour.

Behold a fourth. "Last year I myself conversed with a gentlewoman of such high perfection, that she said, No man could teach her any thing, and went to no place of worship for years together: however, she was a scold, and beat her maid." Perhaps so. And what is that to me? If she is a member of our Society, tell me her name; and she will be in it no longer. This is our glorying. It must be, that many members of our Society will from time to time grow weary of well-doing; yea, that some will fall into sin. But as soon as this appears, they have no more place among us. We regard no man's person, high or low, rich or poor. A disorderly walker cannot continue with us.

Again. "One told God in prayer, that she was perfect, as God himself was perfect." "Another prayed, Grant, O Lord, that all here present may be perfect as I am perfect," (p. 45.) Till you name the men, this too must go for nothing. But suppose it all true, what will it prove? Only that there are madmen in the world.

"I could also tell him of a woman, who was so perfect, that she tried to sin and could not." Pray name her.

"Mr. W. must also well remember a certain perfect married lady, who was got with child by a perfect preacher." I do not remember any such thing. I never heard of it before.

29. But "I hate," says Mr. H. "the law of retaliation." —Truly one would not have thought it.—"And would not have mentioned these things, but that you set me the example," *i. e.* but by way of retaliation. "Should you doubt the truth of these instances, I will lead you to the fountain-head of my intelligence." That will not do. In order to *be even* with Mr. F. you have told seven shocking stories. Several of these I know to be false: I doubt if any, but that of George Bell, be true. And now you offer

to "lead Mr. F. to the fountain-head of your intelligence!" Probably to one or two renegade Methodists, who court the world, by slandering their brethren! "But Mr. W. adopts this way." No, never. In my letter to Mr. Hervey, I occasionally name two famous men; but I do not slander them. In my Journals I name several others. This is above board: but Mr. H. stabs in the dark. He gives us no names, no places of abode; but casts arrows and firebrands abroad. And let them light where they may, on guilty or guiltless: of that he takes no care.

30. It remains only, to consider the queries, which Mr. H. addresses directly to *me*.

1. "Did not you in administering the sacrament, a few years ago, to a *perfect* society in West-street chapel, leave out the confession?

Yes, and many times since. When I am straitened for time, (as I generally am there, on a Monday,) I begin the communion-service at, "We do not presume to come to this thy table." One Monday Mr. Madan desired to stay. Here, I suppose, is "the fountain-head of this intelligence."

2. "Did not one of the Enthusiasts then say, he had heard a voice telling him, *He was all holiness to the Lord?*"

Possibly so: but I remember nothing of it.

3. "Did not a second declare the same thing?"

Not that I remember.

4. "Did not George Bell say, he should never die?"

He often did, if not then.

5. "Did not one present confirm it."

Not unlikely: but I do not remember it.

6. "Did not another perfect brother say, he believed the millennium was near: for there had been more constables sworn in that year than heretofore?"

Are you sure he was a *perfect brother? i. e.* one that professed so to be? As for me, I can say nothing about it. For I neither remember the man, nor the words.

"This I have put down verbatim from the mouth of a

judicious friend then present; but from that time he has been heartily sick of *sinless perfection.*" Say, of *perfect love.*

Is it only *from that time* that Mr. Madan has been sick of it? Was he not sick of it before?

7. "Do not you know a clergyman, one closely connected with you, who refused a great witness for perfection the sacrament, because he had been detected in bed with a *perfect sister?*"

No. I never heard of it before. Surely Mr. M——d is not fallen so low, as to *invent* such a tale as this!

I need not say any thing to your last anecdote, since you (for once!) "put a candid construction upon my words." If I did speak them, which I can neither affirm nor deny, undoubtedly my meaning was, (as yourself observe,) "Though I have been holding forth the imputed righteousness of Christ to a mixed congregation, yet I think it right to caution you of the society, how you abuse that doctrine, which to some, who turn it into licentiousness, is a smooth doctrine, of which you ought to beware." (p. 61.) But your friend, it seems, "who gave you this account," did not put so candid a construction on my words. You say, "he was so struck, as hardly to refrain from speaking to you in the chapel. And from that hour he gave up all connections with you." *i. e.* He *sought* a pretence; and he *found* one!

And now what does all this amount to? Several persons who professed high things, degenerated into pride and enthusiasm, and then talked like lunatics, about the time that they renounced connection with me, for mildly reproving them. And is this any objection against the existence of that love which they professed? Nay, and I verily believe once enjoyed, though they were afterward *moved from their steadfastness.* Surely no more than a justified person's running mad, is an objection against justification. Every doctrine must stand or fall by the Bible. If the perfection I teach agree with this, it will stand, in spite of all the enthusiasts in the world: if not, it cannot stand.

31. I now look back on a train of incidents that have occurred, for many months last past, and adore a wise and gracious Providence, ordering all things well! When the Circular Letter was first dispersed throughout Great Britain and Ireland, I did not conceive the immense good, which God was about to bring out of that evil. But no sooner did Mr. Fletcher's first Letters appear, than the scene began to open. And the design of Providence opened more and more, when Mr. S.'s narrative, and Mr. H.'s letters, constrained him to write and publish his Second and Third Check to Antinomianism. It was then indisputably clear, that neither my Brother nor I had borne a sufficient testimony to the truth. For many years, from a well-meant but ill-judged tenderness, we had suffered the reprobation preachers, (vulgarly called *gospel-preachers!)* to spread their poison, almost without opposition. But at length they have awakened us out of sleep: Mr. Hill has answered for all his brethren, roundly declaring, that "any agreement with election-doubters is a covenant with death." It is well: we are now fore-warned and fore-armed. We look for neither peace nor truce, with any who do not openly and expressly renounce this diabolical sentiment. But since God is on our side, we will not fear what man can do unto us. We never before saw our way clear, to do any more than act on the defensive. But since the Circular Letter has sounded the alarm, has called forth all their hosts to war; and since Mr. H. has answered the call, drawing the sword, and throwing away the scabbard: what remains, but to own the hand of God, and make a virtue of necessity? I will no more desire any *Arminian*, so called, to remain only on the defensive. Rather chase the fiend, Reprobation, to his own hell, and every doctrine connected with it. Let none pity or spare one limb of either speculative or practical Antinomianism: or of any doctrine that naturally tends thereto, however veiled under the specious name of *Free-Grace*. Only remembering, that however we are treated by men, who have a dispensation from the vulgar rules of justice and mercy, we are

not to fight them at their own weapons, to return railing for railing. Those who plead the cause of the God of love, are to imitate him they serve: and however provoked, to use no other weapons than those of truth and love, of scripture and reason.

32. Having now answered the queries you proposed; suffer me, Sir, to propose one to you; the same which a gentleman of your own opinion proposed to me some years since. "Sir, how is it that as soon as a man comes to the knowledge of *the truth*, it spoils his temper?" That it does so I had observed over and over, as well as Mr. J. had. But how can we account for it? Has *the truth*, (so Mr. J. termed what many love to term *the doctrine of free-grace,)* a natural tendency to *spoil the temper?* To inspire pride, haughtiness, superciliousness? To make a man *wiser in his own eyes than seven men that can render a reason?* Does it naturally turn a man into a cynic, a bear, a Toplady? Does it at once set him free from all the restraints of good-nature, decency, and good-manners? Cannot a man hold *distinguishing grace*, as it is called, but he must distinguish himself for passion, sourness, bitterness? Must a man as soon as he looks upon himself to be an absolute favourite of heaven, look upon all that oppose him as *Diabolonians*, as predestinated dogs of hell? Truly, the melancholy instance now before us, would almost induce us to think so. For who was of a more amiable temper than Mr. Hill, a few years ago? When I first conversed with him in London, I thought I had seldom seen a man of fortune, who appeared to be of a more humble, modest, gentle, friendly disposition. And yet this same Mr. H. when he has once been grounded in the *knowledge of the* truth, is of a temper as totally different from this, as light is from darkness! He is now haughty, supercilious, disdaining his opponents, as unworthy to be set with the dogs of his flock! He is violent, impetuous, bitter of spirit! In a word the author of *the Review!*

O Sir, what a commendation is this of your doctrine? Look at Mr. H. the *Arminian!* The loving, amiable, generous, friendly man. Look at Mr. H. the *Calvinist!* Is it the same person? This spiteful, morose, touchy man? Alas, what has *the knowledge of the truth* done? What a deplorable change has it made? Sir, I love you still; though I cannot esteem you, as I did once. Let me entreat you, if not for the honour of God, yet for the honour of your cause, avoid for the time to come, all anger, all spite, all sourness and bitterness; all contemptuous usage of your opponents, not inferior to you, unless in fortune. *O put on again bowels of mercies, kindness, gentleness, long-suffering; endeavouring to hold,* even with them that differ from you in opinion, the *unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace!*

BRISTOL, *Sept.* 9, 1772.

SOME

REMARKS

ON

Mr. Hill's Farrago Double-distilled.

"If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men."
ROM. xii. 18.

1. IT is far from my design to give a particular answer to every thing contained in Mr. Hill's late treatise. I intend only to offer to the impartial reader, a few cursory remarks, which may partly explain and partly confirm what I have already said upon the subject.

2. "Poor Mr. Wesley,"* says Mr. Hill, opening his cause with native eloquence, "has published various tracts, "out of which Mr. Hill collects above a hundred gross con- "tradictions. At this Mr. W.'s temper is much ruffled;" (I believe not; I am not sensible of it;) "he primes, cocks, "and fires at Calvinism: and there is smoke and fire in "plenty. But if you can bear the stench, (which indeed is "very nauseous) there is no danger of being wounded, "(p. 4.) He calls this last cannon, or pop-gun, Remarks "on my Review. Men of sense say, it is quite unfit for

* Page 3. Quotations from Mr. Hill are marked with double, from the *Remarks*, with single commas.

"duty: men of grace compassionate the *caster* of it: men "of pleasantry laugh heartily at it; but some good old "women speak highly of it," (p. 5.) I give this passage at some length, as a genuine specimen of Mr. Hill's manner of writing.

3. But "as Mr. Hill did not choose to prefix his name, "*it argued no great proof of* Mr. W.'s *politeness*, to ad-"dress him in the personal manner he has done." Which of us began? Was it not Mr. Hill? Did not he address me in a personal manner first? And some, beside the old women, are of opinion, he did not do it in the *politest* manner in the world.

4. "Mr. W. would have us know, that his piece is writ-"ten in much *love*. But what *love?* Love to his own in-"consistencies; love of scolding, love of abuse. Let the "reader find out any other sort of love through the whole "performance." In order to judge whether I wrote in love or not, let any one read the words he has picked out of fifty-four pages, just as they stand connected with others in each page: it will then appear they are not contrary either to love or meekness.

5. But Mr. W. says, Mr. Hill "is unworthy the name "either of the gentleman or the Christian: and is amazed, "that Mr. Hill should lay claim to either of those titles," (p. 6.) Not so. It is my belief, that Mr. Hill is both a gentleman and a Christian: though I still think, in his treatment of Mr. Fletcher and me, he has acted beneath his character. Yet it is very likely, "a friend of yours, "(not mine) might say, I wrote in *much wrath*," (p. 7.) I wrote then in just as much wrath as I do now; though *your* friend might think otherwise.

6. Nay, but Mr. W. "gives all the Calvinist Ministers "the most scurrilous, Billingsgate language, while he is "trumpeting forth his own praises, in Mr. F.'s Second "Check to Antinomianism," (p. 8.) A small mistake. I do not give Billingsgate language to any one: I have not so learned Christ. Every one of those hymns, out of which Mr. Hill culls the harshest expressions, are not

mine, but my brother's. Neither do I "trumpet forth my own praises." Mr. Hill's imagining I do, arises from an innocent mistake. He continually takes for granted that I read over and correct all Mr. F.'s books before they go to the press. So far from it, that the Fourth Check to Antinomianism I have not read over to this day. But Mr. W. "thinks himself to be *the greatest minister in the world.*" Exceedingly far from it. I know many now in England, at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus.

7. To that question, Why does a man 'fall upon me, 'because another gave him a good beating?' Mr. Hill answers, "If your trumpet had not given the alarm, we "should not have prepared ourselves for the battle," (p. 53.) Nay truly, not mine, but Mr. Shirley's. I was sitting quietly in my study, on the other side of St. George's channel, when his trumpet gave the alarm. Yet I say again, I am not now sorry for these disputes though I was sorry. You say, truly, "Mr. W.'s temper has been manifested" hereby, (p. 56.) Let all candid men judge between us, Whether Mr. F. and I on the one hand, or Mr. Hill on the other, has shewn more "meekness and lowliness?" And which of us has expressed the greatest heat, and the most cordial contempt of his opponent.

Mr. H. adds, "Hereby Mr. Charles Wesley's Calvinism is exposed by Mr. John." Then that is exposed, which never existed, for he never was a Calvinist yet. And "hereby Mr. H. says, the Christian Library is given up as nothing." Mere finesse! Every one sees my meaning, but those that will not see it. It is *nothing to your purpose:* it *proves nothing of what it is brought to prove.* In the same sense I set the word nothing over against the citations from Mr. Baxter and Goodwin.

8. If Mr. Hill says, he *always was* a Calvinist, I have no right to contradict him. But I am sure he was of a widely different temper, from that he has shewn in his late writings. I allow much to his belief, that in exposing me to the utmost of his power, he is doing God service. Yet I must needs say, if I were writing against a Turk or a Pagan, I

durst not use him as Mr. Hill does me. And if I really am, (which will one day appear,) employing all my time, and labour, and talents, (such as they are) for this single end, that the kingdom of Christ may be set up on earth: then he whom I serve in the gospel of his Son, will not commend him for his present work.

9. But what makes Mr. Hill so warm against me? I still believe it is for this chiefly, because I am an Arminian, an Election-doubter. For, says he, the "good old "preacher, places all election-doubters, (that is, those who "are not clear in the belief of Absolute Predestination,) "among the numerous hosts of the Diabolonians. One of "these being brought before the judge, the judge tells him "he must die," (p. 35.) That is plainly, he must die eternally for this damnable sin. I beg Mr. Hill to explain himself on this head. Does he still subscribe to the sentence of this good *old preacher*? Are all election-doubters to be placed among the Diabolonians? Is the sentence irreversibly passed, That they must all die eternally? I must insist on Mr. Hill's answering this question: if not, silence gives consent.

10. Mr. H. farther affirms, "The only cement of Chris-"tian union is the love of God. And the foundation of "that love must be laid, in believing *the truths of God*:" that is, you *must believe* particular redemption, or it is impossible you should love God. For, to use "the words of Dr. Owen in his display of Arminianism," (see what truths, Mr. Hill means!) "an agreement without truth is no peace, "but a covenant with death, and a conspiracy against the "kingdom of Christ," (p. 93.) Here again I beg an explicit answer. Will Mr. H. affirm this in cool blood? If he will, there needs no more to account for his enmity both to me and the Minutes. "Nay but the foundation is struck at by "those wretched minutes," (p. 52.) True, the foundation of Calvinism. So I observed before; I know it well. If the Minutes stand, Calvinism falls. But Mr. Hill says, "The "doctrines of election and perseverance are very little, "indeed scarcely at all dwelled on in the Review." Now

I think they are very much dwelt on therein, and desire any that have eyes to judge.

11. We come now to the main question, Is the *Farrago* true or false? I aver it to be totally false: except in one single article out of a hundred and one. I mean Mr. Hill had not proved that I contradict myself except in that single instance. To come to particulars.

I.

"1. There was an *everlasting covenant* between the Fa-
"ther and Son, concerning man's redemption. (There
"never was such a covenant.")

The former proposition is taken from the Christian Library: on which Mr. Hill says again, "Mr. W. affirms,
"that the Christian Library is *all true, all agreeable to the*
"*word of God.*" I answered before, 'I do not,' (Rem. p. 12.) My words are, (Pref. p. 4,) 'I have *endeavoured* to 'extract such a collection of English divinity, as *I believe*, 'is all true, all agreeable to the oracles of God.' I did *believe*, and do *believe*, *every tract* therein to be true, and agreeable to the oracles of God. But I do not roundly affirm this 'of *every sentence* contained in the fifty volumes. 'I could not possibly affirm it, for two reasons, 1. I was 'obliged to prepare most of those tracts for the press just 'as I could snatch time in travelling; not transcribing 'them; (none expected it of me.) but only marking the 'lines with my pen, and altering a few words here and 'there, as I had mentioned in the preface. 2. As it was 'not in my power to attend the press, that care neces-'sarily devolved on others; through whose inattention a 'hundred passages were left in, which I had scratched 'out. It is probable too, that I myself might overlook 'some sentences, which were not suitable to my own prin-'ciples. It is certain, the correctors of the press did this, 'in not a few instances. The plain inference is, if there are 'a hundred passages in the Christian Library, which con-'tradict any or all of my doctrines, these are no proofs that 'I contradict myself. Be it observed once for all, there-'fore, citations from the Christian Library, prove nothing 'but the carelessness of the correctors.'

12. Yet Mr. Hill, as if he had never seen a word of this, or had solidly refuted it, gravely tells us again "If Mr. W. "may be credited, the Farrago is all true: part of it being "taken out of *his own* Christian Library, in the preface of "which he tells us, that the contents are *all true, all* "*agreeable to the oracles of God.* Therefore *every single* "*word* of it *is his own*, either by birth or adoption," (p. 12.) No: I never adopted, I could not adopt *every single word* of the Christian Library. It was impossible I should have such a thought, for the reasons above-mentioned.

But "there is very great evasion," (p. 16.) says Mr. Hill, "in Mr. W.'s saying, that though he believes *every* "*tract to be true*, yet he will not be answerable for *every* "*sentence or expression* in the Christian Library: whereas "the matter by no means rests upon a few sentences or "expressions, but upon *whole treatises*, which are diame-"trically opposite to Mr. W.'s present tenets; particularly "the treatises of Dr. Sibs, Dr. Preston, Bishop Beveridge, "and Dr. Owen, on Indwelling Sin."

13. Just before Mr. H. affirmed, "*Every single word* in "the Christian Library is *his own*." Beaten out of this hold, he retreats to another: but it is as untenable as the former. "The matter," he says, "does not rest on a "*few sentences: whole treatises* are diametrically opposite "to his present tenets." He instances in the works of Dr. Sibs, Preston, Beveridge, and a treatise of Dr. Owen's.

I join issue with him on this point. Here I pin him down. The works of Dr. Preston and Sibs, are in the ninth and tenth volumes of the Library: that treatise of Dr. Owen's in the seventeenth; that of Bishop Beveridge in the forty-seventh. Take which of them you please: suppose the last, Bishop Beveridge's *Thoughts upon Religion.* Is this *whole treatise* "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" The *Resolutions* take up the greatest part of the book; every sentence of which exactly agrees with my present judgment; so do at least nine parts in ten of the preceding *Thoughts*, on which those *Resolutions* are formed. Now what could possibly induce a person of Mr. Hill's

character, a man of a good understanding and of a generous temper, a well-bred gentleman and a serious Christian, to violate all the rules of justice and truth, which at other times he so earnestly defends, by positively, deliberately, roundly asserting so entire a falsehood, merely to blacken one who loves his person, who esteems his character, and is ready to serve him in any thing within his power! What but so violent an attachment to his opinion, as while that is in danger, suspends all his faculties, so that he neither can *feel*, nor *think*, nor *speak* like himself?

14. In the ninth and tenth volumes are two treatises of Dr. Preston's, *The Breastplate of Faith and Love*, and *The New Covenant*. Is either of these "diametrically opposite "to my present tenets." By no means. If a *few sentences* here and there (and this I only suppose, not grant) were carelessly left in, though I had scratched them out, which seem (perhaps only seem) to contradict them; these are not *the whole tracts:* the general tenor of which I still heartily subscribe to.

The tenth volume likewise contains *Two Sermons* of Dr. Sibs, and his *Tract upon Solomon's Song*. Are any of these "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" No more than those of Dr. Preston's. I as willingly as ever subscribe to these also.

Is Dr. Owen's tract, *Of the Remainder of Indwelling Sin in Believers*, "diametrically opposite to my present tenets?" So far from it, that a few years since, I published a sermon on the very same subject. I hope there is no room to charge me with "quirk, quibble, artifice, evasion," on this head; (though I believe as much as on any other.) I use only plain, manly reasoning; and such logic I am not ashamed to avow before the whole learned world.

15. But "I will go farther still," says Mr. Hill. "Let "Mr. W. only bring me twenty lines together, out of the "writings of those four eminent divines, as they stand in "the Christian Library: and I will engage to prove, that "he has twenty times contradicted them in some of his "other publications," (p. 19.) Agreed. I bring him the

following twenty lines with which Dr. Preston begins his treatise called *The New Covenant*. (Vol. X. p. 47.)

These words of God to Abraham contain a precept of sincerity, or perfect walking with God, "Walk before me, and be thou perfect;" and also the motive thereunto, God's all-sufficiency, "I am God all-sufficient." As if he should say, if there were any defect in me, if thou didst need or couldst desire any thing that were not to be had in me, and thou mightest have it elsewhere, perhaps thy heart might be imperfect in walking towards me. Thou mightest then step out from me, to take in advantages elsewhere. But seeing I am all-sufficient; since I have enough in me to fulfil all thy desires; since I am every way an adequate object, so that all thy soul can wish for, thou mayest have in me; why then shouldst thou not consecrate thyself to me alone? Why then shouldst thou be uneven in thy ways, serving me sometimes, and sometimes the creature? For there is nothing in the creature, but thou mayest find in me. "I am all-sufficient: therefore walk before me, and be thou perfect!"

Here are exactly twenty lines, neither more nor less, "as they stand in the Christian Library." Now fulfil your engagement; prove that I "have twenty times contradicted them in some other of my publications." If you cannot, acknowledge you have done me wrong. In the heat of your resentment, you have undertaken what you are not able to perform. You have spoken rashly and unadvisedly. You have gone much too far, far beyond the bounds of wisdom as well as of love.

16. Nay, but "I will go one step farther yet, I defy Mr. "W. to bring me twenty lines out of the above tracts, by "Preston, Sibs, Owen, and Beveridge, which he now be-"lieves." Is it possible, that Mr. H. should believe himself, while he is talking at this rate? Or does he expect that any one else should believe him, unless he be drunk with passion or prejudice? Was ever any thing so wild? But I accept of this challenge, and that with more seriousness than it deserves. I will go no farther than the twenty

lines cited above: all these I "now believe." And I believe, as I said before, not only the whole treatise from which those words are taken, but the tenor of the whole Christian Library.

Mean time it has been acknowledged again and again, that *several sentences* stand therein, which I had put out in my usual manner, by drawing my pen through them. Be it observed therefore once more, that those passages prove nothing but the carelessness of the correctors; consequently all the pains bestowed to collect them together, whether by Mr. Hill or his coadjutors, is absolutely lost labour, and never can prove that I contradict myself.

17. The case is nearly the same with regard to those other tracts which I published many years ago, Mr. *Baxter's Apkorisms on Justification, and John Goodwin's Tract* on the subject. I have lately read them both over with all the attention I am capable of: and I still believe they contain the true Scripture-doctrine concerning justification by faith; but it does not follow, that I am accountable for every sentence contained in either of those treatises.

"But does Mr. W. believe the doctrine therein con-"tained, or does he not?" I do: and John Goodwin believed the doctrine contained in the sermon on "The Lord our Righteousness:" the sum of which is, 'We are justi-'fied, sanctified, and glorified, for the sake of what Christ 'has done and suffered for us.' Nothing he asserts is inconsistent with this, though it may be inconsistent with passages left in the Christian Library: when therefore I write *nothing* against those passages, or the extracts from Goodwin, that contradict them, this does not prove (as Mr. Hill archly says) that "I have nothing to say," but that all those passages and extracts put together are nothing to the purpose. For were it true that John Goodwin and Richard Baxter contradicted all those passages, it is nothing to the point in hand; it never can prove, that I, John Wesley, contradict myself.

18. But to return to *the Everlasting Covenant*. "Mr. "W. himself, in his annotations on Gen. i. 1, calls the *Elohim* a *covenant God*." True, in covenant with man.

But I say not one word of any covenant between the Father and the Son. But "in his note on Isa. lv. 4, speaking of the covenant made between God and David, he says, 'This David is Christ.' Undoubtedly I do: but what is this brought to prove? My words are, 'I have appointed, and 'will in due time give *him*—the David last-mentioned, even 'Christ—*a witness*—to declare the will of God concerning 'the duty and salvation of men, to bear witness to the 'truth, to confirm God's promises, and among others, those 'which respect the calling of the Gentiles: to be a witness 'to both parties of that covenant made *between God and man*,' (p. 209.) Yes, of the covenant made *between God and man!* Of a covenant *between the Father and the Son* here is not a word.

"The only possible conclusion to be drawn from this de-"fence of Mr. W.'s is, That he became a commentator on "the bible, before he could read the bible." That is pity! If he could not read it when he was three-score years old, I doubt he never will. See the candour, the good-nature of Mr. Hill! Is this *Attic* salt, or wormwood?

What conclusion can be possibly drawn in favour of Mr. Hill? The most favourable I can draw is this, That he never read the book which he quotes: that he took the word of some of his friends. But how shall we excuse them? I hope they trusted their memories, not their eyes. But what recompense can he make to *me*, for publishing so gross a falsehood; which nevertheless those who read his tract, and not mine, will take to be as true as the gospel?

II.

Of Election and Perseverance.

19. In entering upon this head, I observed, 'Mr. Sellon 'has clearly shewn, that the seventeenth article does not 'assert absolute predestination. Therefore in denying this, 'I neither contradict that article nor myself.' (p. 13.)

It lies therefore upon Mr. Hill, to answer Mr. Sellon before he witticizes upon *me*. Let him do this, and he talks to the purpose: otherwise all the pretty, lively things he

says about Dr. Baroe, Bishop Wilkins, Dr. Clark, and George Bell, are utterly thrown away.

As to George Bell, Mr. Richard says, M. M——d "justly "censures the *enthusiasm* and *credulity* of Mr. John, in "paying so *much attention* to Bell's ridiculous reveries; in "calling him a *sensible* man, and *entreating* him to continue "in his society, on account of the great good he did. How-"ever, Bell *refused* to remain in connexion with him, be-"cause of his *double dealings* and *unfaithful proceedings*: "for he sometimes was full of Bell's praises; at other times "he would warn the people against him. He also gives a "particular narration of what he rightly calls the *Comet-"enthusiasm*. Mr. John preached *more than ten times* "about the comet, which he *supposed* was to appear in "1758, to burn up all the produce of the earth, and lastly "to execute its grand commission on the globe itself, caus-"ing the stars to fall from heaven," (p. 37.)

What a heap of dirt is here raked together! I must not let it pass quite unnoticed. 1. He "justly censures the "*enthusiasm* and *credulity* of Mr. W. in paying so *much* "*attention* to Bell's ridiculous reveries." Nay, so very little, that I checked them strongly, as soon as ever they came to my knowledge: particularly his whim about the end of the world, which I earnestly opposed both in private and public. 2. "Bragging of the *many miraculous* cures "he had wrought." I *bragged of*, that is, simply related the case of Mary Special, and no other: in the close of which I said, 'Here are three plain facts, she was ill; she is well; she 'became so in a moment. Which of these can, with 'any modesty, be denied?' I still ask the same question. 3. That I ever called him a *sensible* man, is altogether false. A man of faith and love I then *knew* him to be; but I never thought him a man of sense. 4. That I *entreated* him to continue in the society, is likewise totally false. 5. Nor did I ever tell *him*, on that or any other occasion, of "the great good" he did. I knew, he was an instrument in God's hand, of convincing and converting many sinners. But though I speak this now to all the world, I never spoke

it to himself. 6. Neither did he ever *refuse* what never was asked, "to remain in connexion with me." 7. Least of all did he refuse it because of my *double dealings* or *unfaithful proceedings*. He never mentioned to me any such thing, nor had he any pretence so to do. 8. Nay, but you "were at some times full of Bell's praises"—Very moderately full:—"At other times"—that is, after he ran mad—"you warned the people against him." I warned them not to regard his prophecies; particularly with regard to the 28th of February. (Journal X. p. 99.)

20. "He also gives us a particular narration of what he "rightly calls the *Comet-enthusiasm*. Mr. John preached "*more than ten times about the Comet* he supposed was to "appear in 1758, and to consume the globe." This is a foolish slander, as it is so easily confuted. A tract was published at that very time, entitled, "Serious Thoughts occasioned by the Earthquake at Lisbon." The thing which I then accidentally mentioned in preaching, (twice or thrice; it may be, four times,) is there set down at large, much more at large than ever I mentioned it in any sermon. The words are these.

"Dr. Halley fixes the return of the Comet, which appeared in 1682, in the year 1758." (Observe, Dr. Halley does this, not I.) On which he adds, "But may the great, "good God avert such a shock or contact of such great "bodies, moving with such forces, (which however is by no "means impossible,) lest this most beautiful order of things "be entirely destroyed, and reduced into its ancient chaos," (p. 14, &c.)

'But what if God should not avert this contact? what would the consequence be?'—That consequence I afterwards describe.—'Burning up all the produce of the earth, 'and then the globe itself.' But do I affirm or *suppose*, that it *actually will* do this? I suppose, nay, affirm, at the bottom of the same page, the direct contrary. 'What 'security is there against all this, on the *infidel* hypothesis? 'But on the Christian there is *abundant security*: for the 'prophecies are not yet fulfilled.'

21. So much for the *Comet-enthusiasm*. We return now to the point of *unconditional election*. "One would ima-"gine," says Mr. Hill, "by Mr. W.'s quoting the 31st "Article, in *contradiction* to the 17th, that he thought the "Reformers as inconsistent as himself." I did not quote the 31st in *contradiction* to the 17th, but in *explication* of it. The latter, the 31st, can bear but one meaning: therefore it fixes the sense of the former. "Nay, this article speaks "nothing of the *extent* of Christ's death, but of its *all-suffi-"ciency*," (p. 54.) Nothing of the extent! Why, it speaks of nothing else: its all-sufficiency is out of the question. The words are, "The offering of Christ once made, is that "perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all "the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." It is here affirmed, the death of Christ is a perfect satisfaction for *all the sins of the whole world*. It *would be* sufficient for a thousand worlds. But of this the article says nothing.

But "even Bishop Burnet allows our Reformers to have been zealous Calvinists." He does not allow them *all* to be such: he knew and you know the contrary. You cannot but know, that Bishop Ridley, Hooper, and Latimer, to name no more, were firm Universalists.

22. But the contradictions! Where are the contradictions? "Why, sometimes you deny election: yet another "time you say,

"From all eternity with love
"Unchangeable thou hast me view'd," (p. 21.)

I answered, 'I believe this is true, on the supposition of *faith foreseen*, not otherwise.'

Here is therefore no contradiction, unless on that supposition, which I do not allow.

But sometimes "you deny the perseverance of the saints." Yet in one place you say, 'I do not deny, that those emi-'nently styled the *elect shall* persevere.' I mean those that are *perfected in love*. So I was inclined to think for many years. But for ten or twelve years I have been fully convinced, that even these may *make shipwreck of the faith*.

23. But "several of Mr. Hill's quotations are from Mr. "Charles Wesley's hymns, for which Mr. John says, he will "not be answerable."

I will now explain myself on this head. 1. Though there are some expressions in my brother's hymns, which I do not use, as being very liable to be misconstrued: yet I am fully satisfied, that in the whole tenor of them, they thoroughly agree with mine, and with the bible: 2. That there is no jot of Calvinism therein; that not one hymn, not one verse of a hymn, maintains either unconditional election, or infallible perseverance. Therefore I can readily answer Mr. H.'s question, "How can Mr. W. answer it to his own "conscience, to write prefaces and recommendations to hymns which he does not believe?" There is the mistake. I do believe them: although still I will not be answerable for *every expression* which may occur therein. But as to those expressions which you quote, in proof of final perseverance, they prove thus much, and no more, that the persons who use them have at that time *the full assurance of hope*. Hitherto then Mr. Hill has brought no proof, that I contradict myself.

III.

Of Imputed Righteousness. (p. 23.)

24. "Blessed be God, we are not among those who are "so *dark* in their conceptions and expressions. We no "more deny (says Mr. W.) the *phrase* of *imputed righteous-* "*ness*, than *the thing*." It is true: for I continually affirm, To them that believe, *faith is imputed for righteousness*. And I do not contradict this, in still denying that *phrase*, the *imputed righteousness of Christ*, to be in the bible; or in beseeching both Mr. Hervey and you, 'Not to dispute for '*that particular phrase*.'

But "since Mr. W. blesses God for enlightening him to "receive the doctrine, and to adopt the phrase of imputed "righteousness; how came he to think that *clear concep-* "*tions* of the doctrine were so unnecessary, and the phrase "itself so useless, after having so *deeply lamented* the

"*dark conceptions* of those who rejected the term and the thing?"

It was neither this *term*, *The imputed righteousness of Christ*, nor the *thing*, which Antinomians mean thereby, the rejection of which I supposed to argue any *darkness of conception*. But those I think *dark* in their conceptions, who reject either the *Scripture-phrase*, *faith imputed for righteousness*, or the *thing* it means.

25. However, to prove his point, Mr. Hill goes on:

"This doctrine (of the imputed righteousness of Christ) "I have constantly believed "and taught for near eight "and twenty years."	The use of the term (the imputed righteousness of Christ) is not scriptural, it is not necessary; it has done immense hurt.

"It has done immense hurt, says Mr. W. but here is no "contradiction. Whether there be or not, there is a plain "concession from Mr. W. himself, that he has been *preaching a doctrine for eight and twenty years together, which "has done immense hurt.*"

Let this (one instance out of a hundred) be a specimen of Mr. Hill's fairness! The whole strength of the argument depends on the artful jumbling of two sentences together, and inserting two or three little words into the latter of them.

My words are, 'We no more deny the *phrase* (of imputed righteousness) than the thing,' (p. 14.)

'*This doctrine* I have believed and taught for near eight 'and twenty years,' (p. 15.)

These distinct sentences Mr. Hill is pleased to thrust together into one, and to mend thus:

"This doctrine (of *the* imputed righteousness *of Christ*) "I have constantly believed and taught for near eight and "twenty years."

And here, says Mr. H. is a "plain concession from Mr. "W. himself, that he has been preaching a doctrine for "twenty-eight years together, which has done immense "hurt."

No, the doctrine which I believe has done immense hurt, is that of the imputed righteousness of Christ in the Anti-

nomian sense. The doctrine which I have constantly held and preached is, that faith is imputed for righteousness.

And when I have either in that sermon or elsewhere said, that *the righteousness of Christ is imputed to every believer*, I mean, every believer is justified for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. Yet still I think, "There is no use "in contending for *that particular phrase*." And I say still, 'I dare not insist upon it, because I cannot find it in 'the bible.'

To contradict this, Mr. H. cites these words, 'This is 'fully consistent with our being justified, through the im-'putation of Christ's righteousness.' Mr. W.'s notes on Rom. iv. 9. Mr. H. adds, "These two taken together, "produce the following conclusion, that it is *perfectly con-"sistent* to say, that we are justified by that, *which cannot "be found in the bible*," (p. 24.)

That note runs thus: '*Faith was imputed to Abraham for 'righteousness.* This is fully consistent with our being jus-'tified through the imputation of the righteousness of 'Christ: that is, our being pardoned and accepted of God, 'for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered. For 'though this, and this alone, be the *meritorious cause* of our 'acceptance with God, yet faith may be said to be *imputed 'to us for righteousness*, as it is the sole *condition* of our 'acceptance.'

Now is there any shadow of contradiction in this? Or of our being justified *by that which cannot be found in the bible?*

26. "Mr. W. frequently puts the expression, *imputed "righteousness*, in the mouth of a whole congregation." Yet he says, 'I dare not *require* any to use it.' Hence Mr. Hill deduces these two conclusions:

1. "That Mr. W. gives out such doctrines, as *he dares "not require any others to believe*," (p. 25.)

By what logic is this deduced? We are not speaking of *doctrines* at all, but simply of a particular *expression*. And that expression is not, *imputed righteousness: but the imputed righteousness of* Christ.

2. "That a whole congregation may have words in their "mouths, and yet be *all silent*."

Well inferred again! But did I say, 'A whole congrega-"tion had *those words* in their mouths?" I did not either say or suppose it; any more than that they were *all silent*.

"Will Mr. W. be ingenuous enough to tell me, Whe-"ther he did not write this, when he was last in a certain "country, which abounds with *crassa ingenia?*" I will. I did not write this in the fogs of Ireland, but in the clear air of Yorkshire.

27. The two next propositions Mr. Hill quotes, are, 'They to whom the righteousness of Christ is imputed,' (I mean, who truly believe,) 'are made righteous by the 'Spirit of Christ, are renewed in the image of God, in 'righteousness and true holiness.'

'The nice, metaphysical doctrine of imputed righteous-'ness, (if it is not carefully guarded,) 'leads not to repent-'ance, but to licentiousness. I have known a thousand 'instances of this.'

And where is the contradiction between these propositions? "It is just this," says Mr. Hill, "That the doctrine "of imputed righteousness makes those who believe it both "holy and unholy," (p. 26.)

Unfold the propositions a little more, and then let any man judge.

The first means just this, They whom God justifies, for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered, (whether they ever heard of that phrase, imputing the righteousness of Christ, or not,) are sanctified by his Spirit; are renewed in the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness.

The second means, I have known very many, who so rested in the doctrine of the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, that they were quite satisfied without any holiness at all.

Now where is the contradiction?

But my inserting in my own sentence those explanatory words, 'I mean, who truly believe,' Mr. H. calls an *interpolation*, and supposes I "mean to make a distinction be-

tween faith in Christ, and faith in the righteousness of Christ." I mean just what I have said again and again, particularly in the note above cited. And this is the very thing which John Goodwin means, as he declares over and over.

Mr. W. "winds up this point of *imputed righteousness* "with a resolution which astonishes me, That 'he will never "more use the phrase, *the imputed righteousness of Christ*, "unless it occur to him in a hymn, or steal upon him una-"wares.'" This is my resolution. I repeat once more what I said in the Remarks, 'The *thing*, that we are justified 'merely for the sake of what Christ has *done* and *suffered*, 'I have constantly and earnestly maintained, above four 'and thirty years. And I have frequently used the *phrase*, 'hoping thereby to *please* others, *for their good to edification*. 'But it has had a contrary effect, since so many improve it 'into an objection. Therefore I will use it no more,' (I mean the phrase *Imputed Righteousness*: that phrase, the *Imputed Righteousness of Christ*, I never did use.) 'I will endeavour 'to use only such phrases as are *strictly scriptural*. And I 'will advise all my brethren, all who are in connexion with 'me throughout the three kingdoms, to lay aside that am-'biguous, unscriptural phrase,' *(the imputed righteousness of Christ.)* 'which is so liable to be misinterpreted, and speak 'in all instances, this in particular, *as the oracles of God*."

IV.

Of a Two-fold Justification. (p. 37.)

My words cited as contradicting this, run thus.:—

28. 'In the afternoon I was informed, how many wise 'and learned men, who cannot in terms *deny* it, (because our 'articles and homilies are not yet repealed) *explain* justifi-'cation by faith, (p. 38.) They say justification is two-fold, 'the first in this life, the second at the last day, &c.——In 'opposition to this, I maintain, That *the justification spoken* '*of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles*, is not two-'fold: it is one and no more.' True. And where do I contradict this? Where do I say, *the justification spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles*, is any more

than one? The question between them and me concerned *this* justification, and *this* only, which I affirmed to be but one. They averred, But there is a second justification at the last day: therefore justification is not one only. Without entering into that question, I replied, '*The justification whereof St. Paul and our Articles speak*, is one only.' And so I say still. And yet I do not deny, that there is another justification (of which our Lord speaks) at the last day.

I do not therefore condemn the distinction of a two-fold justification, in saying, that *spoken of in our Articles* is but one. And this is the thing which I affirmed, "in flat opposition to those men."

29. But "how is it possible to encounter such a man as "this, without watching him through every line? And "therefore I wish my readers would closely compare the "Remarks with the Review itself:" (I desire no more. Whoever does this, will easily discern on which side the truth lies:) "As it is impracticable to point out half the "*little arts* of this kind which Mr. W. has stooped to." That is, in civil terms, "Sir, you are a knave." Sir, I crave your mercy. I stoop to no art, but that of plain, sound reasoning. By this art, and by this alone, I am able to untwist truth from falsehood, how skilfully soever they are woven together. I dare use no other; for (whether you know it or not) I fear God. And by his grace, in simplicity and godly sincerity, I have my conversation in the world.

"But how agrees this with what Mr. W. tells us, that he "has never contradicted himself with regard to justifica-"cation, since the year 1738?" (p. 39.) Perfectly well. "How long has he held, that justification is *four-fold?*" I have said nothing about it yet. "And how will he recon-"cile this with its being two-fold, and with his preceding "affirmation, that it is *one and no more?*" When time is, this mystery too may be cleared up.

V.

Of a Justified State. (p. 34.)

30. Mr. W. says, "The *state* of a *justified* person is in-"expressibly great and glorious."

Yet he asks elsewhere, "Does not talking of a justified "or sanctified state, tend to mislead men?" He answers, 'It *frequently* does mislead men,' (namely, when it is spoken of in an *unguarded manner,)* 'But where is the contradiction?' "Whatever may be the contradiction, this is "clearly the conclusion, that Mr. W. by his own confes- "sion, *is a misleader of men.*"

It is not quite clear yet. You have first to prove, that I use the phrase 'in an *unguarded manner.*' I confess, when it is so used, it tends to mislead men; but I do not confess, that I use it so.

VI.

Are Works a Condition of Justification?

31. "Mr. W. says, 'No *good works* can be previous to "'justification.' And yet in the same page he asserts, "'Whoever desires to find favour with God, should cease "'from evil, and learn to do well.'"

I answered, 'Does not the bible say so? Who can deny 'it? Nay, but Mr. W. asks, If this be not in order to find 'favour, what does he do them for? And I ask it again. 'Let Mr. Hill, or any one else, give me an answer. So if 'there is any contradiction here, it is not I contradict my- 'self, but Isaiah and our Lord that contradict St. Paul,' (Remarks, p. 22.)

Mr. Hill replies, "Then a man may do works in order to "find favour, and yet such works cannot be called *good.*" You may call them so, if you please: but be not angry with *me*, if I do not. I still believe, no *good works* can be done before justification. Yet I believe, (and that without the least self-contradiction,) that final salvation is 'by works as a condition.' And let any one read over the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, and deny it if he can.

VII.

Is Justification by Faith *Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ?* (p. 15.)

32. In the beginning of the year 1738, I believed it was so. Soon after, I found reason to doubt. Since that time I have not varied. "Nay, but in the year 1768, you say,

"'This is the name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord* "*our Righteousness.* A truth this, of which may be affirmed, "(what Luther affirms of a truth nearly connected with it, "justification by faith,) it is *Articulus stantis vel cadentis* "*ecclesiæ.* It is certainly the pillar and ground of that faith "of which alone cometh salvation.'"

I answered, 'It is certain, here is a *seeming* contradic-'tion; but it is not a real one: for these two opposite pro-'positions do not speak of the *same thing.* The latter 'speaks of *justification by faith:* the former, of *trusting in* '*the righteousness* or merits *of Christ.* (Justification by 'faith is only mentioned incidentally in a parenthesis.) Now 'although Mr. Law denied *justification by faith,* he might '*trust in the merits of Christ.* It is this, and this only that 'I affirm, (whatever Luther does,) to be '*Articulus stantis* '*vel cadentis ecclesiæ.*' (Rem. p. 24.)

But Mr. Hill thinks "Justification by faith, and by "trusting in the merits of Christ, are all one," (p. 16.) Be they or not, I still think, 'Some may doubt of justifi-'cation by faith, and yet not perish everlastingly.' Does Mr. Hill judge, that such an one cannot be saved? That all Mystics, (as well as Mr. Law,) go to hell?

VIII.

Both Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness are imputed.

They are; the question is only, in what sense?

IX.

Of MERIT. (p. 35.)

33. In the Minutes I say, 'We are rewarded *according* '*to our works,* yea, *because of* our works, (Gen. xxii. 16, '17.) How differs this from *for the sake of* our works? 'And how differs this from *secundum merita operum,* or as 'our works deserve? Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.' I say so still. Let Mr. Hill, if he can.

'And yet I still maintain,' (so I added in the Remarks: so I firmly believe) 'there is no *merit,* taking the word 'strictly, but in the Blood of Christ: that salvation is not 'by the *merit* of works: and that there is nothing we are,

'or have, or do, which can, strictly speaking, *deserve* the 'least thing at God's hand.'

'And all this is no more than to say, take the word *merit* 'in a *strict* sense, and I utterly renounce it: take it in a '*looser* sense, and though I never use it, (I mean, I never 'ascribe it to any man,) yet I do not condemn it. There-'fore with regard to the word *merit*, I do not contradict 'myself at all.'

"You never use the word!" says Mr. Hill. "What "have we then been disputing about?" (p. 36.) Why, about a straw: namely, Whether there be a sense in which others may use that word without blame.

But can Mr. Hill, or any one living, suppose me to mean, I do not use the word in the present question?

What Mr. Hill adds, is a mere play upon words. "Does "Mr. W. by this *looser merit*, mean a merit that does not "*merit*?" Yes. By terming a work *meritorious* in this *improper* sense, I do not mean, that it *merits* or *deserves* a reward in the *proper* sense of the word. Instances of the word taken in this *improper* sense, occur all over the bible.

"This is shamefully evasive." No more than it is Greek. It is a plain, rational, solid distinction: and it holds with regard to numberless words in all languages, which may be taken either in a *proper* or *improper* sense.

'When I say, 'I do not grant, that works are *merito-*'*rious*, even when accompanied by faith,' I take that word in a *proper* sense. But others take it in an *improper*, as nearly equivalent with *rewardable*. Here therefore I no more contradict Mr. Fletcher, than I do myself. Least of all do I plead, as Mr. Hill roundly affirms, "for justifi-"cation by the *merit* of my own good works," (p. 52.)

X.

Of MARRIAGE. (p. 39.)

34. "Mr. W. says, his thoughts on a single life are just "the same they have been these thirty years." (I mean with regard to the advantages which attend that state in general.) "Why then did he marry?" I answered short, 'For reasons best known to himself.' As much as to say,

I judge it extremely impertinent, for any but a superior to ask me the question. So the harmless raillery which Mr. Hill pleases himself with upon the occasion, may stand just as it is.

XI.

Concerning DRESS. (p. 40.)

35. "Mr. W. advises his followers to wear *nothing of a* "*glaring colour*, nothing *made in the height of the fashion*, "in order to *increase their reward*, and *brighten their crown* "*in heaven.*"

"Nevertheless in his letter to a Quaker, he says, 'To "make it a point of conscience, to differ from others, as to "the shape and colour of their apparel, is mere *super-* "*stition.*'"

"Yet he says, 'So I advise; but I do not make it a "*point of conscience.*' It follows, that we are to increase "our reward, and brighten our crown in heaven, by doing "that which is mere *superstition*, and without acting from "a *point of conscience.*"

I shall say more on this head than I otherwise would, in order to shew every impartial reader, by one instance in a thousand, the manner wherein Mr. H. continually distorts and murders my words.

In my advice to the people called Methodists,* I say, 'I 'would not advise you to imitate the people called Quakers, 'in those particularities of dress, which can answer no end, 'but to distinguish you from all other people. But I ad- 'vise you to imitate them in plainness: 1. Let your ap- 'parel be cheap, not expensive: 2. Let it be grave, not 'gay or showy; not in the point of the fashion.'

'Would you have a farther rule? Then take one you 'may always carry in your bosom. *Do every thing with a* '*single eye*, and this will direct you in every circumstance. 'Let a single intention to please God prescribe, both what 'clothing you shall buy, and the manner wherein it shall

* Vol. IX. Page 42.

'be made, and how you shall put on and wear it. In other 'words, let all you do in this respect, be so done, that you 'may offer it to God, a sacrifice acceptable through Jesus 'Christ: so that consequently it *may increase your reward*, 'and *brighten your crown in heaven*.'

Now is there any thing ridiculous in all this? I would appeal even to a rational deist, whether it be not, upon the Christian scheme, all agreeable to the highest reason?

36. "But it is inconsistent with what you said elsewhere, 'To make it a point of conscience, to differ from others, as 'the Quakers do, in the shape or colour of their apparel, is 'mere superstition."

Not inconsistent at all. It is mere superstition to make wearing a broad-brimmed hat, or a coat with four buttons, (the very thing I referred to in the preceding page,) a point of conscience, that is, a thing necessary to salvation.

Why then, says Mr. Hill, "we are to increase our re-"ward, and brighten our crown in heaven, by doing what "is *mere superstition*, and without acting from a *point of* "*conscience!*"

Was ever such twisting of words? Has he not great reason to cry out, "O rare *Logica Wesleiensis! Qui bene distinguit, bene docet!*" I bless God, I can distinguish reason from sophistry; unkind, unjust, ungenteel sophistry, used purely for this good end, to asperse, to blacken a fellow Christian—because he is not a Calvinist!

No, Sir: What I call superstition, and no point of conscience, is wearing a Quaker hat or coat; which is widely different from the plainness of dress that I recommended to the people called Methodists. My *logic* therefore stands unimpeached; I wish your *candour* did so too. I would engage to answer every objection of Mr. Hill's, as fairly and fully as this. But I cannot spare so much time, I am called to other employment. And I should really think, Mr. Hill might spend his time better, than in throwing dirt at his quiet neighbours.

XII.

Of TEA. (p. 41.)

37. "Mr. W. published a tract against drinking tea, and "told the tea-drinkers, he would set them an example in "that piece of self-denial."

'I did set them an example for twelve years. Then at 'the close of a consumption, by Dr. Fothergill's direction, 'I used it again.'

"Why then did Mr. W. re-publish this tract, making "the world believe, it brought a paralytic disorder upon "him?" Before I was twenty years old, it made my hand shake, so that I could hardly write. "Is it not strange "then, that Dr. Fothergill should advise Mr. W. to use "what had before thrown him into the *palsy?*" I did not say so: I never had the palsy yet; though my hand shook, which is a *paralytic disorder*. But be it strange or not, so Dr. F. advised; if you believe not *me*, you may inquire of himself. The low wit that follows, I do not meddle with: I leave it with the gentle reader.

XIII.

Of BAPTISM. (p. 42.)

38. Mr. W. says, 'As there is no clear proof for *dipping* 'in Scripture, so there is very probable proof to the con- 'trary.'

"Why then did you at Savannah baptize all children by "immersion, *unless the parents* certified they were weak?"

I answered, 'Not because I had any scruple, but in 'obedience to the rubric.'

Mr. Hill, according to custom, repeats the objection, without taking the least notice of the answer.

As to the story of half drowning Mrs. L. S., let her aver it to my face, and I shall say more. Only observe, Mr. Toplady, is not "my friend." He is all *your own;* your friend, ally, and fellow-soldier:

——————— *Ut non*
Compositi melius cum Bytho Bacchius!

You are in truth, *Duo fulmina belli.* It is not strange, if

their thunder should quite drown the sound of my "poor pop-guns."

39. "But what surpasses every thing else is, that "Mr. W. cannot even speak of his contradictions, without contradicting himself. For he absolutely denies, "not only that he ever was unsettled in his principles, "but that he was ever accused of being so, *either by "friends or foes*," (p. 38, 39.) *Either by friends or foes!* I will rest the whole cause upon this. If this be true, I am out of my wits. If it be false, what is Mr. Hill? An honest, upright, sensible man; but a little too warm, and therefore not seeing so clearly in this as in other things.

My words are, 'My friends have oftener accused me of 'being too stiff in my opinions, than too flexible. My 'enemies have accused me of both, and of every thing be-'sides,' (Rem. p. 39.) Is this "denying that ever I was "accused of inconsistency *either by friends or foes?*

I do still deny, that Mr. Delamotte spoke to me, "of my "wavering, unsettled disposition," (p. 43.) But "he "spoke to you," says Mr. Hill, "*of something else?*" It is very likely he might.

40. Mr. W. is equally self-inconsistent "with regard to "the Mystics. These he tells us he had *once in great ve-"neration;*" (p. 14.) (I had two or three and forty years ago,) "as the *best explainers of the gospel of Christ.* Yet "afterwards he declares he *looks upon them, as one great "Antichrist.*" I did look upon them as such thirty years ago. But in my Remarks I say, 'I retract this. It is far too strong.' But observe, I never contradicted it till now. But how does this agree with Mr. W.'s saying, "I never "was in the way of Mysticism at all?"

Perfectly well: I admired the mystic writers. But I never *was in their way;* leaving off the outward means.

"But why did Mr. W. let the expression stand, *Solomon is the chief of the mystics?*" Perhaps because I thought it an harmless one, and capable of a good meaning. But I ob-

serve again: Mr. H. takes it for granted, that I have the correction of Mr. Fletcher's books. This is a mistake; of some I have; of others I have not.

41. Now comes the capital instance of self-inconsistency. "In 1770, Mr. W. esteems the Minutes the standard of "orthodoxy. In 1771, he signs a paper, owning them to "be *unguarded*. In 1772, he tells us, he does not know "but it would have been better, not to have signed that "paper at all!" (p. 13.) Suppose all this true, what will it prove? Only that I made a concession which was made an ill use of.

But "Mr. F.'s defence makes poor Mr. W. appear more "and more inconsistent. Mr. W. declares the Minutes to "be *unguarded*:" (that is *not enough guarded* against cavillers:) "Mr. F. defends them, and strives to reconcile "them with the Declaration. But then comes Mr. W. and "tells us, he does not know, but it had been better not to "have signed it at all." And what then? Why "hereby "he intimates, that he has fixed a different sense upon the "Minutes from that which they originally bore." No such thing; he intimates this and no more, that by that well-intended concession, he had given occasion to those who sought occasion of offence against him. So all this laboured charge vanishes into air, and no more proves inconsistency than high-treason.

42. We come now to the main point, *Perfection*; the objections to which spread almost throughout the book. But the question is not, Whether the doctrine be true or false? But whether I contradict myself concerning it?

As to what occurs in the fourth and fifth pages it may, therefore, suffice to say, I do believe (as you observe) that *real Christians*, (meaning those that are *perfected in love*,) are freed from *evil or sinful thoughts*. And where do I contradict this?

P. 10. "You say, I cannot prove the facts alleged "against some professors of perfection. Indeed I can." If you could, that would not prove that I contradict myself on this head.

"But one at W——r writes, 'I send you an account of "two or three shocking instances of bad behaviour among "the professors of perfection here." Perhaps so. But will that prove my inconsistency?

43. Awhile since Mr. Ma——d related to me the whole story of Samuel Wi——n. I know not that I ever heard it before, but only some imperfect fragments of it. The other story, of "one who said, the Holy Ghost visibly de-"scended on all true converts," may be true for ought I know, but I question much, whether that madman was a preacher? It may likewise be true, that several wild expressions were uttered at West-street Chapel. Yet I think, all these put together will not prove, that I contradict myself.

However, I am glad to read, "If I publish another edi-"tion of the *Review*, these instances shall all be omitted: "and *personal vilifications* shall be left to the sole pen "of Mr. W." Then you will reduce your *Farrago* to a page, and your *Review* to a penny pamphlet. But still *personal vilification* will not suit my pen. I have better employment for it.

44. You say, p. 23, "Let us now proceed to Mr. W.'s "assertions on sinless perfection."

As I observed before, I am not now to dispute Whether they are right or wrong? I keep, therefore, to that single point, Do I herein contradict myself, or not?

When I said, 'If some of our hymns contradict others,' I did not allow, they do. I meant only, if it were so, this would not prove, that I contradict myself. "But still it "proves, the people must sing contradictions." Observe; that is, If——

In your account of perfection, blot out *No wandering thoughts*. None in the body are exempt from these. This we have declared over and over; particularly in the sermon written upon that subject.

If in the sermon on Eph. ii. 8, (not xi. 5, as your blunderer prints it,) the words which I had struck out in the preceding edition, are inserted again, what will this prove?

Only that the printer, in my absence, printed, not from the last, but from an uncorrected copy. However, you are hereby excused from unfairness, as to that quotation. But what excuse have you in the other instance, with regard to Enoch and Elijah? On which I asked, 'Why is Mr. 'Hill so careful to name the first edition? Because in the 'second the mistake is corrected. Did he know this? And '*could* he avail himself of a mistake which he *knew* was 'removed before he wrote?' (Rem. p. 29.)

It is now plain he *could!* Nay, instead of owning his unfairness, he endeavours to turn the blame upon me! "You are as inconsistent in your censures as in your doc-"trines: you blame me for quoting the last edition of your "sermon; whereas you call me to account for quoting the "*first* edition of your notes, concerning Enoch and Elijah: "each of whom you have proved, by a peculiar rule of "*Foundry-Logic*, to be both in heaven and out of heaven." So without any remorse, nay, being so totally unconcerned as even to break jests on the occasion, you again 'avail 'yourself of a mistake which you knew was removed before 'you wrote!'

45. But Mr. W. "hath both *struck out* some words, and "*put in* others, into the sermon."—This is a common complaint with Mr. Hill; on which therefore it is needful to explain.

I generally abridge what I answer; which cannot be done without *striking out* all unessential words. And I generally *put in* to quotations from my own writings, such words as I judge will prevent mistakes.

Now to the contradictions.

'If we say we have no sin *now remaining*, (I mean, after 'we are justified,) we deceive ourselves.'

I believe this: and yet I believe

'Sin shall not *always* in our flesh *remain*!'

Again, 'Many *infirmities* do remain.'

This I believe: and I believe also

'He that is born of God, (and *keepeth himself*, I John v.

'18,) *sinneth not by infirmities*, whether in act, word, or 'thought.'

I believe, likewise, that in those perfected in love,

'No wrinkle of infirmity,
No spot of sin remains.'

My brother, at the bottom of the page, expressly says, 'No '*sinful* infirmity.' So whether this be scriptural or not, here is no contradiction.

I have spoken so largely already concerning sins of *surprise* and *infirmity*, that it is quite needless to add any more. I need only refer to the *Remarks*, at the 34th and following pages.

46. But to go on.

'I wrestle not now.'

This is an expression of my brother's, which I do not subscribe to.

'We wrestle not with flesh and blood.'

"This he allows to be his own," (p. 31.)

Indeed I do not: although it is true, 'the *perpetual war* 'which I speak of in the note on Eph. vi. 13, is *a war with* '*principalities and powers, but not with flesh and blood.*' "But either way Mr. John is stuck fast in the mire. For "in his *Remarks* he contradicts his brother: in his *Anno-* "*tations* he contradicts himself: and in his *Hymn* he con- "tradicts both his brother and himself."

Mr. John is not quite *stuck fast* yet: for this is a mistake from beginning to end. 1. I do not contradict my brother in my *Remarks*. In saying, 'I do not subscribe to that ex- 'pression,' I mean, I do not make it my own; I do not undertake to defend it. Yet neither do I enter the lists against it: it is capable of a sound meaning. 2. I do not contradict myself in the *note*; let him prove it that can. 3. I contradict nobody in the *hymn*; for it is not mine.

Again. 'I never said, While one *evil thought* can rise, 'I am not *born again*. My brother said so once: but he 'took the words in too high a sense.' I add, and in a sense not warrantable by the bible. And yet I believe, that '*real*

'*Christians*, I mean those perfected in love, are freed from 'evil or *sinful thoughts*.'

"But is not a babe in Christ, *born again?* Is he not a "*real Christian?*" He is doubtless born again; and in some sense he is a real Christian: but not in the sense above defined.

47. We come now to the additional contradictions which Mr. Hill undertakes to find in my writings. They are already dwindled into one: and I hope to shew quickly, this one is none at all.—It stands thus.

'Most express are the words of St. John, *We know that 'whosoever is born of God, sinneth not.* Indeed it is said, 'this means only, he doth not commit sin *wilfully* or *habi-'tually*.' (Observe. I do not deny the text to mean this; but I deny that it means *this only*.)

As a contradiction to this, Mr. Hill places these words in the opposite column.

'The apostle John declares, Whosoever is born of God 'sinneth not, 1. By any habitual sin; nor, 2. By any *wilful 'sin*.' True; but do I say, the apostle means *this only?* Otherwise here is no contradiction. So although you have got the gallows ready, you have not turned off *old Mordecai* yet. As you so frequently give me that appellation, I, for once, accept of your favour.

48. "Before I quit this subject" (of perfection,) "I can-"not help expressing my astonishment, that Mr. W. should "deny that his tenets on that point exactly harmonize with "those of the popish church; since all the decrees and "books that have been published by the Roman clergy, "prove this matter beyond a doubt."

I believe, you have been told so. But you should not assert it, unless from personal knowledge. "Alexander "Ross says so." What is Alexander Ross? See with your own eyes. "Mr. Hervey too gives an account of "Lindenus and Andradius." *Second-hand evidence* still. Have you seen them yourself? Otherwise you ought not

to allow their testimony. "As to that most excellent and "evangelical work," as you term it, the eleven letters ascribed to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Sellon has abundantly shewn, that they are most excellently virulent, scurrilous, and abusive; and full as far from the evangelic spirit, as the Koran of Mahomet.

"But Bishop Cowper"—I object to him, beside his being a *hot, bitter* Calvinist, that he is a dull, heavy, shallow writer. And let him be what he may, all you cite from him is second-hand authority.—"Nay, I refer to the bishop's "own words." But still you have only the words at second-hand. In order to know the tenets of the church of Rome, you must read the Romish authors themselves. Nay, it does not suffice to read their own private authors. They will disown any thing we charge them with, unless we can prove it, by recurring to their public and authentic records. Such are the *Canones & Decreta Concilii Tridentini.* Such the *Catechisms ad Parochos.* Till you have read these at least, you should never undertake to determine what is, or what is not popery.

49. "But as I am now on the subject of popery, I must "make a few animadversions on what Mr. W. affirms, 'I "always thought the tenets of the church of Rome, were "nearer by half to Mr. Hill's tenets, than to Mr. W.'s.'" (p. 33.) Nay, give the honour of this to its true author; Mr. H. goes to consult a Popish friar at Paris, a Benedictine Monk, one Father Walsh, concerning the Minutes of the Conference. Father W. (Mr. H. says; and I see no reason to scruple his authority here;) assures him, that the Minutes contain false doctrine: and that the tenets of the church of Rome are nearer by half to his (Mr. Hill's) tenets than they are to Mr. W.'s. (So Mr. Hill himself informs the world, in the Paris Conversation of famous memory: which I really think, he would never have published, unless as the vulgar say, the devil had owed him a shame.) I add, 'Truly I always thought so.' But I am the more confirmed therein, by the authority of so competent a judge: espe-

cially when his judgment is publickly delivered by so unexceptionable a witness.

50. Nay, but "you know the principles of the Pope and "of John Calvin, are quite opposite to each other." I do not know, that they are opposite at all in this point. Many Popes have been either Dominicans or Benedictines. And many of the Benedictines, with all the Dominicans, are as firm Predestinarians as Calvin himself. Whether the present Pope is a Dominican, I cannot tell: If he is, he is far nearer your tenets than mine.

Let us make the trial with regard to your ten propositions.

1. "You deny *election*.	So does the Pope of Rome." I know not that. Probably he holds it.
2. "You deny *perseverance*.	So does the Pope of Rome." That is much to be doubted.
3. "You deny *imputed righteousness*.	Perhaps, the Pope of Rome does; but I assert it continually.

4. "You hold *free-will*. So does the Pope of Rome." No, not as I do, (unless he is a Predestinarian: otherwise) he ascribes it to *nature*, I to *grace*.

5. "You hold, that works are a condition of justification.	If you mean *good works*, I do not.
6. "You hold *a two-fold justification*, one now, another at the last day.	So does the Pope of Rome." And so do all Protestants, if they believe the bible.
7. "You hold the doctrine of *merit*.	I do not. Neither does the Pope, if father Walsh says true.
8. "You hold *sinless perfection*.	So does the Pope." I deny that. How do you prove it?
9. "You hold, that *sins* are only *infirmities*.	I hold no such thing. And you know it well.
10. "You distinguish between *venial* and *mortal* sins."	Not so; I abhor the distinction.

Now let every man of understanding judge, whether father Walsh did not speak the very truth?

51. "This pamphlet was finished, when I was told, that "Mr. W. had lately a very remarkable dream, which "awakened him out of a sound sleep. This dream he com-"municated to his society. It was in substance as follows. "A big, rough man came to him, and gave him a violent "blow on the arm with a red-hot iron," (p. 51.)

"Now the interpretation thereof I conceive to be as "follows:

1. "The *big, rough man*, is Mr. Hill:

2. "The *bar of iron* (red-hot) is *Logica Wesleiensis:*

3. "The *blow* denotes *the shock* which Mr. John will re-"ceive by the said pamphlet:

4. "His being *awakened out of a sound sleep*, signifies "there is yet hope, that he will some time or other come to "the right use of his spiritual faculties."

Pretty and well devised! And though it is true I never had any such dream since I was born, yet I am obliged to the inventor of it; and that on many accounts.

I am obliged to him, 1. For sending against me only a *big, rough man:* it might have been a lion, or a bear: 2. For directing the *bar of iron* only to my arm; it might have been, my poor scull: 3. For letting the *big man* give me only *one blow;* had it been repeated, I had been slain outright: and, 4. For hoping I shall, some time or other, come to the right use of my spiritual faculties.

52. Perhaps Mr. Hill may expect, that I should make him some return for the favour of his heroic poem. But

"Certes I have, for many days
"Sent my poetic herd to graze."

And had I not, I should have been utterly unable to present him with a parallel. Yet upon reflection, I believe I can; although, I own, it is rather of the lyric, than the heroic kind. And because possibly he may be inclined to write notes on this too, I will tell him the origin of it. One Sunday, immediately after sermon, my father's clerk said, with an audible voice, "Let us sing to the praise and glory of God,

"A hymn of mine own composing." It was short and sweet, and ran thus:

"King William is come home, come home:
"King William home is come!
"Therefore let us together sing
"The hymn that's call'd Te D'um!"

53. Before I conclude, I beg leave, in my turn, to give you a few advices.

And, 1. *Be calm.* Do not venture into the field again, till you are master of your temper. You know, *the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness*, neither promotes the truth, *of God.*

2. Be *good-natured.* Passion is not commendable; but *ill-nature* still less. Even irrational anger is more excusable than *bitterness*, less offensive to God and man.

3. *Be courteous.* Shew good manners as well as good-nature to your opponent of whatever kind. "But he is rude." You need not be so too. If you regard not him, "Reverence yourself."

Absolutely contrary to this, is the crying out at every turn, "Quirk, sophistry, evasion!" In controversy these exclamations go for nothing. This is neither better nor worse than *calling names.*

4. *Be merciful.* When you have gained an advantage over your opponent, do not press it to the uttermost. Remember the honest Quaker's advice to his friend a few years ago, "Art thou not content to lay John Wesley upon his back, but thou wilt tread his guts out?"

5. In writing, do not consider yourself as a *man of fortune*, or take any liberty with others on that account. These distinctions weigh little more in the literary world, than in the world of spirits. Men of sense simply consider, what is written: not whether the writer be a lord or a cobbler?

Lastly, Remember, *For every idle word men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment.* Remember, *by thy words shalt thou be justified; or by thy words shalt thou be condemned!*

BRISTOL, *March* 14, 1773.

A

LETTER

TO A

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

1. YOU have heard ten thousand stories of us who are commonly called Protestants, of which, if you believe only one in a thousand, you must think very hardly of us. But this is quite contrary to our Lord's rule, *Judge not, that ye be not judged;* and has many ill consequences, particularly this, It inclines us to think as hardly of you. Hence we are on both sides less willing to help one another, and more ready to hurt each other. Hence brotherly love is utterly destroyed: and each side looking on the other as monsters, gives way to anger, hatred, malice, to every unkind affection; which have frequently broke out in such inhuman barbarities, as are scarce named among the Heathens.

2. Now can nothing be done, even allowing us on both sides to retain our own opinions, for the softening our hearts towards each other, the giving a check to this flood of unkindness, and restoring at least some small degree of love among our neighbours and countrymen? Do not you wish for this? Are you not fully convinced, that malice, hatred, revenge, bitterness, whether in us or in you, in our hearts or yours, are an abomination to the Lord? Be our opinions right or be they wrong, these tempers are unde-

niably wrong. They are the broad road that leads to destruction, to the nethermost hell.

3. I do not suppose all the bitterness is on your side. I know there is too much on our side also. So much that I fear many Protestants (so called) will be angry at me too, for writing to you in this manner; and will say, "It is shewing you too much favour; you deserve no such treatment at our hands."

4. But I think you do. I think you deserve the tenderest regard I can shew, were it only because the same God hath raised you and me from the dust of the earth, and has made us both capable of loving and enjoying him to eternity: were it only because the Son of God has bought you and me with his own blood. How much more, if you are a person fearing God, (as without question many of you are,) and studying to have a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man?

5. I shall therefore endeavour, as mildly and inoffensively as I can, to remove in some measure the ground of your unkindness, by plainly declaring what our belief, and what our practice are: that you may see, we are not altogether such monsters as perhaps you imagined us to be.

A true Protestant may express his belief in these, or the like words.

6. As I am assured, that there is an infinite and independent Being, and that it is impossible there should be more than One; so I believe, that this One God is the Father of all things, especially of angels and men: That he is, in a peculiar manner, the Father of those whom he regenerates by his Spirit, whom he adopts in his Son, as coheirs with him, and crowns with an eternal inheritance: but in a still higher sense, the Father of his only Son, whom he hath begotten from eternity.

I believe this Father of All, not only to be able to do whatsoever pleaseth him, but also to have an eternal right of making what, and when, and how he pleaseth, and of possessing and disposing of all that he has made: and that

he of his own goodness created heaven and earth, and all that is therein.

7. I believe that JESUS of Nazareth was the Saviour of the world, the Messiah so long foretold: That being anointed with the Holy Ghost, he was a Prophet, revealing to us the whole will of God: That he was a Priest, who gave himself a sacrifice for sin, and still makes intercession for transgressors: That he is a King, who has power in heaven and in earth, and will reign till he has subdued all things to himself.

I believe, he is the proper, natural Son of God, God of God, very God of very God: And that he is the Lord of All, having absolute, supreme, universal dominion over all things: but more peculiarly *our* Lord, who believe in him, both by conquest, purchase, and voluntary obligation.

I believe, that he was made man, joining the human nature with the divine in one person: being conceived by the singular operation of the Holy Ghost, and born of the blessed Virgin Mary, who as well after as before she brought him forth, continued a pure and unspotted Virgin.

I believe, he suffered inexpressible pains both of body and soul, and at last death, even the death of the cross, at the time that Pontius Pilate governed Judea, under the Roman emperor: that his body was then laid in the grave, and his soul went to the place of separate spirits: That the third day he rose again from the dead: That he ascended into heaven; where he remains in the midst of the throne of God, in the highest power and glory, as Mediator till the end of the world, as God to all eternity: That in the end, he will come down from heaven, to judge every man according to his works; both those who shall be then alive, and all who have died before that day.

8. I believe the Infinite and Eternal Spirit of God, equal with the Father and the Son, to be not only perfectly holy in himself, but the immediate cause of all holiness in us; enlightening our understandings, rectifying our wills and affections, renewing our natures, uniting our persons to

Christ, assuring us of the adoption of sons, leading us in our actions; purifying and sanctifying our souls and bodies, to a full and eternal enjoyment of God.

9. I believe, that Christ and his apostles gathered unto himself a church, to which he has continually added such as shall be saved: That this Catholic, that is, Universal Church, extending to all nations and all ages, is holy in all its members, who have fellowship with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: That they have fellowship with the holy angels, who constantly minister to these heirs of salvation: And with all the living members of Christ on earth, as well as all who are departed in his faith and fear.

10. I believe God forgives all the sins of them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy gospel; and that at the last day, all men shall rise again, every one with his own body.

I believe, that as the unjust shall after their resurrection be tormented in hell for ever, so the just shall enjoy inconceivable happiness in the presence of God to all eternity.

11. Now, is there any thing wrong in this? Is there any one point which you do not believe as well as we?

But you think we ought to believe more. We will not now enter into the dispute. Only let me ask, If a man sincerely believes thus much, and practises accordingly, can any one possibly persuade you to think, that such a man shall perish everlastingly?

"But does he practise accordingly?" If he does not, we grant all his faith will not save him. And this leads me to shew you in few and plain words, what the practice of a true Protestant is.

I say, a true Protestant: for I disclaim all common swearers, sabbath-breakers, drunkards; all whoremongers, liars, cheats, extortioners: in a word, all that live in open sin. These are no Protestants: they are no Christians at all. Give them their own name: they are open Heathens. They are the curse of the nation, the bane of society, the shame of mankind, the scum of the earth.

13. A true Protestant believes in God, has a full confi-

dence in his mercy, fears him, with a filial fear, and loves him with all his soul. He worships God in spirit and in truth, in every thing gives him thanks: calls upon him with his heart as well as his lips, at all times and in all places; honours his holy name and his word, and serves him truly all the days of his life.

Now, do not you yourself approve of this? Is there any one point you can condemn? Do not you practise, as well as approve of it? Can you ever be happy if you do not? Can you ever expect true peace in this, or glory in the world to come, if you do not believe in God through Christ, if you do not thus fear and love God? My dear friend, consider, I am not persuading you to leave or change your religion, but to follow after that fear and love of God, without which all religion is vain. I say not a word to you about your opinions or outward manner of worship. But I say all worship is an abomination to the Lord, unless you worship him in spirit and in truth, with your heart as well as your lips, with your spirit and with your understanding also. Be your form of worship what it will; but in every thing give him thanks; else it is all but lost labour. Use whatever outward observances you please, but put your whole trust in him: but honour his holy name and his word, and serve him truly all the days of your life.

14. Again. A true Protestant loves his neighbour, that is, every man, friend or enemy, good or bad, as himself, as he loves his own soul, as Christ loved us. And as Christ laid down his life for us, so is he ready to lay down his life for his brethren. He shews this love, by doing to all men in all points as he would they should do unto him. He loves, honours, and obeys his father and mother, and helps them to the uttermost of his power. He honours and obeys the king, and all that are put in authority under him. He cheerfully submits to all his governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters. He behaves lowly and reverently to all his betters. He hurts no body by word or deed. He is true and just in all his dealings. He bears no malice or hatred in his heart. He abstains from all evil-speaking,

lying, and slandering, neither is guile found in his mouth. Knowing his body to be the temple of the Holy Ghost, he keeps it in sobriety, temperance, and chastity. He does not desire other men's goods, but is content with that he hath, labours to get his own living, and to do the whole will of God in that state of life unto which it has pleased God to call him.

15. Have you any thing to reprove in this? Are you not herein even as he? If not, (tell the truth,) are you not condemned, both by God and your own conscience? Can you fall short of any one point hereof without falling short of being a Christian?

Come, my brother, and let us reason together. Are you right if you only love your friend, and hate your enemy? Do not even the Heathens and Publicans so? You are called to love your enemies: to bless them that curse you, and to pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you. But are you not disobedient to the heavenly calling? Does your tender love to all men, not only the good, but also the evil and unthankful, approve you the child of your Father which is in heaven? Otherwise whatever you believe, and whatever you practise, you are of your father the devil. Are you ready to lay down your life for your brethren? And do you do unto all as you would they should do unto you? If not, do not deceive your own soul. You are but a Heathen still. Do you love, honour, and obey your father and mother, and help them to the utmost of your power? Do you honour and obey all in authority? All your governors, spiritual pastors and masters? Do you behave yourself lowly and reverently to all your betters? Do you hurt no body by word or deed? Are you true and just in all your dealings? Do you take care to pay whatever you owe? Do you feel no malice, or envy, or revenge, no hatred or bitterness to any man? If you do, it is plain, you are not of God; for all these are the tempers of the devil. Do you speak the truth from your heart to all men, and that in tenderness and love? Are you an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile? Do you keep your body in

sobriety, temperance, and chastity, as knowing it is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and that if any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy? Have you learned in every state wherein you are, therewith to be content? Do you labour to get your own living, abhorring idleness as you abhor hell-fire? The devil tempts other men; but an idle man tempts the devil. An idle man's brain is the devil's shop, where he is continually working mischief. Are you not slothful in business? Whatever your hand finds to do, do you do it with your might? And do you do all as unto the Lord, as a sacrifice unto God, acceptable in Christ Jesus?

This, and this alone, is the old religion. This is true, primitive Christianity. O when shall it spread over all the earth? When shall it be found both in us and you? Without waiting for others, let each of us, by the grace of God, amend one.

16. Are we not thus far agreed? Let us thank God for this, and receive it as a fresh token of his love. But if God still loveth us, we ought also to love one another. We ought, without this endless jangling about opinions, to provoke one another to love and to good works. Let the points wherein we differ stand aside; here are enough wherein we agree, enough to be the ground of every Christian temper, and of every Christian action.

O brethren, let us not still fall out by the way. I hope to see *you* in heaven. And if I practise the religion above described, you dare not say I shall go to hell. You cannot think so. None can persuade you to it. Your own conscience tells you the contrary. Then if we cannot as yet *think alike* in all things, at least we may *love alike*. Herein we cannot possibly do amiss. For of one point none can doubt a moment, God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.

17. In the name then, and in the strength of God, let us resolve, first, not to hurt one another: to do nothing unkind or unfriendly to each other, nothing which we would not have done to ourselves. Rather let us endeavour after

every instance of a kind, friendly, and Christian behaviour towards each other.

Let us resolve, secondly, God being our helper, to speak nothing harsh or unkind of each other. The sure way to avoid this, is to say all the good we can, both of and to one another: in all our conversation, either with, or concerning each other, to use only the language of love: to speak with all softness and tenderness; with the most endearing expressions, which is consistent with truth and sincerity.

Let us, thirdly, resolve to harbour no unkind thought, no unfriendly temper towards each other. Let us lay the axe to the root of the tree; let us examine all that rises in our hearts, and suffer no disposition there which is contrary to tender affection. Then shall we easily refrain from unkind actions and words, when the very root of bitterness is cut up.

Let us, fourthly, endeavour to help each other on in whatever we are agreed leads to the kingdom. So far as we can, let us always rejoice to strengthen each other's hands in God. Above all, let us each take heed to himself (since each must give an account of himself to God) that he fall not short of the religion of love; that he be not condemned in that he himself approveth. O let you and I (whatever others do) press on to the prize of our high calling: that being justified by faith we may have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: that we may rejoice in God through Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the atonement: that the love of God may be shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Let us count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord; being ready for him to suffer the loss of all things, and counting them but dung, that we may win Christ.

I am, your affectionate servant, for Christ's sake.

DUBLIN, *July* 18, 1749.

A ROMAN CATECHISM:

WITH A REPLY THERETO.

THE PREFACE.

IT has been a frequent complaint among some of the Romish church, that the Protestants have misrepresented the doctrine of their church: on the other side, the Protestants accuse the writers in that church, of concealing, disguising, and palliating their doctrines. The latter justify their charge by producing such authors as have in several ages not only taught that doctrine, but taught it as the doctrine of their church; the former deny the charge, by appealing from particular authors, to a higher authority, to councils, and public acts and decrees, to missals, breviaries, and catechisms. Now though those Protestants are not to be blamed, when the authors they quote have been first licensed and approved in that church, and were never afterward condemned by it; yet in composing this Catechism, to avoid contention as much as I can, I have generally observed their directions, and have seldom made use of particular authors, but when it is for the explication of a doctrine that is not sufficiently explained, or for confirmation of a doctrine generally received. I am very confident that the quotations throughout are true, having again and again examined them; and I have been as careful as I could, not to mistake the sense of them; that I might rightly understand and truly represent the doctrine which I profess to censure: for without a faithful and impartial examination of an error, there can be no solid confutation of it.

A

ROMAN CATECHISM,

FAITHFULLY DRAWN OUT OF THE ALLOWED WRITINGS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SECTION I.—*Of the Church, and Rule of Faith.*

Q. 1. WHAT is the Church of Rome?

A. The church of Rome is that society of Christians, which professes it necessary to salvation* to be subject to the Pope of Rome, as the alone visible head of the church.†

* Dicimus, definimus, pronunciamus, absolute necessarium ad salutem, omni humanæ creaturæ subesse Romano Pontifici, Extravag. c. *Unam sanctam de majoritate et obedientia.*

We say, define, and pronounce, that it is absolutely necessary to salvation, for every man to be subject to the Pope of Rome.

† Bellarm. de Eccles. milit. l. 3. c. 2. ss. Nostra autem sententia et cap. 5. ss. respondeo neminem.

Q. 2. How comes subjection to the Pope to be necessary to salvation, and an essential note of the church?

A. Because the Pope is Christ's vicar, St. Peter's successor,* and hath the supreme power on earth over the whole church.† "The church is called one, as it has one invisible "head, Christ; and one visible, who doth possess the chair "at Rome, as the lawful successor of St. Peter, prince of "the apostles," (Catech. Rom. par. 1. c. 10. n. 11.)

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 6, Decret. de Reform. cap. 1. Bulli Pii. 4. sup. form. Juram.

† Con. Trid. Sess. 14. c. 7.

THE

REPLY

TO THE

ROMAN CATECHISM.

SECTION I.—*Of the Church and Rule of Faith.*

R. 1. CHRIST *is the Head, from whom the whole body is fitly joined together.* And *the holding* to that *head,* (Col. ii. 19,) is the one great note of the church, given by St. Austin *de unit. Eccles.* c. 3, 4. But there is neither in Scripture, nor antiquity, any evidence for a visible head, and much less for the visible head the pope, and least of all, that it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him.

If it is necessary to salvation to be subject to him, it is necessary to know who is the pope; but that the world hath often been divided about, when there were sometimes three, and for about forty years together two popes. *Vid. Theod. Niem. de Schism. univers.*

R. 2. If Christ gave no such power to St. Peter, or the pope be not St. Peter's successor, then the pope has no pretence to this power. Now we read that 'Christ gave some apostles, and some prophets, for the work of the ministry and the edifying the body,' (Ephes. iv. 11, 12.) But that he gave one apostle pre-eminence above the rest, much less absolute power over them, we read not. This power they were forbidden to attempt or desire, (Matt. xx. 26,) and St. Paul was so far from acknowledging it, that he challenged an equality with the rest of the apostles, (Gal. i. 15, 17.) and upon occasion withstood St. Peter, (Gal. ii. 11.)

To this we may add the judgment of St. Cyprian. "The

Q. 3. What authority doth the church of Rome challenge?

A. She declares that she is the mother and mistress of all churches,* and that to believe her so to be, is necessary to salvation.† Pope Innocent III. thus decreed, As God is called universal Lord, because all things are under his dominion: so the church of Rome is called catholic or universal, because all churches are subject unto her. *Apud Bzovium Annal.* 1199.

* Concil. Later. 4 Can. 2 Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. de Bapt. Can. 3, &c.
† Bulla Pii 4. super form. Jur.

Q. 4. What use doth she make of this authority?

A. She requires all persons upon her sole authority, to receive and believe the doctrines she proposes to be received and believed,* and without the belief of which she declares there can be no salvation.†

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. Decret de Euchar. Sacrosancta synodus omnibus Christi fidelibus interdicit, ne posthac de sanctissima Eucharistia aliter credere, docere aut prædicare audeant, quam ut est hoc præsenti decreto explicatum, atque definitum. *So again*, Sess. 25. Decret. de Purgatorio. *And there are above one hundred Anathemas in that council in point of doctrine against such as do not so believe.*

† Bulla Pii. 4 super form. Juram. *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest:* i. e. *This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved.*

Q. 5. Doth not the church of Rome acknowledge the holy Scripture to be a sufficient rule for faith and manners?

A. No: For there are some doctrines proposed by that church as matters of faith, and some things required as

"other apostles are the same St. Peter was, endowed with "an equal fellowship of honour and power." *Epist. de unit. Eccles.*

R. 3. As it was foretold, (Isaiah ii. 3,) so it was fulfilled, 'Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." There the church began, and therefore in the synodical epistle of the second general council of Constantinople, Jerusalem is called "the mother "of all churches." Baron, A. D. 382, p. 461.

If she is the mistress, because she is the mother, (as pope Innocent the first would have it, Epist. 1. Concil. Tom. 4, p. 5,) then Jerusalem was the mistress. If the mistress, because she was once the imperial city, then Constantinople was so likewise; and accordingly it was decreed in the 4th general council, that of Chalcedon, Can. 28, "That the "church of Constantinople should have equal privileges "with that of Rome, because she is the imperial seat."

And if she claims this sovereign authority upon any other reason, she never had, nor can ever prove a right to it.

R. 4. Gal. i. 11, 12, 'The gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.'

Verse 8, 9, 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be accursed.'

The church of Rome cannot avoid St. Paul's Anathema, when she requires to bow down before an image, which the Scripture forbids: and forbids to read the Scripture, which it requires.

And without doubt the text of the apostle holds as much against any other, as against himself or an angel from heaven.

R. 5. We read in Scripture of 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' Jude 3, and 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, 'All' [or the whole] 'Scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man

necessary duty, which are by many learned men among themselves confessed not to be contained in Scripture.

This is confirmed by Pope Pius II. (when a cardinal) Epist. 288, p. 802, who saith, "that before the time of the "Nicene council, little regard was had to the church of "Rome."

Q. 6. What doctrines of faith and matters of practice are thus acknowledged not to be in Scripture?

A. The doctrines of transubstantiation,* of the seven sacraments,† of purgatory,‡ of the practice of half-communion,§ worshipping of saints and images,‖ indulgencies,¶ and service in an unknown tongue.**

* Scotus in 4 sent. dist. 11. q. 3. et Yribarn in Scot.
† Bellarm. l. 2. de effectu Sacram. c. 25. ss. secunda probatio.
‡ Roffens. contr. Luther art. 18.
§ Concil. Constan. Sess. 13. Cassander. Art. 22.
‖ Bellarm. de cult Sanct. l. 3. c. 9. ss. præterea. Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. ss. 4.
¶ Polyd. Virg. de invent. lib. 8. c. 1.
** Bellarm. de verb. Dei. li. 2. c. 26.

Q. 7. What doth the church of Rome propound to herself as an entire rule of faith?

A. Scripture with tradition; and she requires that the traditions be received and reverenced with the like pious regard and veneration as the Scriptures; and whosoever knowingly contemns them, is declared by her to be accursed. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 4. *Decret de can. Script.*

Q. 8. What do they understand by tradition?

A. Such things belonging to faith and manners as were dictated by Christ or the Holy Ghost in the apostles, and have been preserved by a continual succession in the catholic church, from hand to hand without writing. *Concil. Trid. ibid.*

Q 9. What are those traditions which they profess to have received from Christ and his apostles?

A. The offering the sacrifice of the mass for the souls in

of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.'

The Scripture, therefore, is a rule sufficient in itself and was by men divinely inspired *once* delivered to the world; and so neither needs, nor is capable of any further addition.

So Tertullian, "Let Hermogenes shew that this thing "is written. If it be not written, let him fear the wo "pronounced against them that add to, or take from "Scripture." *Contr. Hermog. c.* 22.

R. 6. On the contrary: St. Augustin, lib. contr. Petil. l. 3. c. 6. writes, "If any one concerning Christ and his "church, or concerning any other things which belong to "faith or life, I will not say if we, but (which St. Paul hath "added) if an angel from heaven preach unto you besides "what ye have received in the law and evangelical writ-"ings, let him be accursed." For as all faith is founded upon divine authority, so there is now no divine authority but the Scriptures: and, therefore, no one can make that to be of divine authority, which is not contained in them. And if transubstantiation and purgatory, &c. are not delivered in Scripture, they cannot be doctrines of faith.

R. 7. Matt. xv. 9, 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men;' forbidding that as unlawful which God hath not forbidden, and requiring that as necessary duty which God hath not required.

So St. Hierom, in cap. 1. Aggæi, "The sword of God "[*his word*] doth smite those other things, which they "find and hold of their own accord, as by apostolical tra-"dition, without the authority and testimony of Scripture."

R. 8. But St. Cyril affirms, "It behoveth us not to de-"liver, no not so much as the least thing of the holy mys-"teries of faith, without the holy Scripture. That is the "security of our faith, not which is from our own inven-"tions, but from the demonstration of the holy Scriptures." *Cateches.* 5.

R. 9. Mark vii. 8, 'Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men.'

St. Basil in Reg. brev. Reg. 95. "It is necessary even

purgatory *, the mystical benedictions, incensings, garments, and many other things of the like kind, † salt, spittle, exorcisms, and wax candles used in baptism, ‡ &c. the priests shaving the head after the manner of a crown. §

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. c. 2. † Ibid. c. 5.

‡ Catech. Rom. par. 2. c. 2. n. 59, 65, &c. § Ibid. c. 7. n. 14.

Q. 10. Doth the church of Rome agree with other churches in the number of canonical books of Scripture?

A. No: for she hath added to the canonical books of the Old Testament, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Esdras, the two books of Maccabees, ‖ and a new part of Esther and Daniel; which whole books, with all their parts, ¶ whosoever rejects as not canonical, is accursed. *Concil. Trident. Sess. 4, Decret. de Scriptur.*

‖ These books are so sacred, as that they are of infallible truth. *Bellarm. de verbo, l. 1. c. 10. ss. Ecclesia vera.*

¶ Wherefore doth the council add *with all their parts?* those parts also, about which there was some time a dispute, belong to the sacred canon of the bible. *Ibid. c. 7. ss. Denique.*

Q. 11. Are the people of the church of Rome permitted to read the Scripture in a tongue vulgarly known?

A. No: they were for a time permitted to read it, under the caution * of a licence, where it could be obtained: but since they are forbid it, or to have so much as any summary or historical *compendium* of it in their own tongue. †

* Reg. Ind. libr. prohib. Reg.

† Index libr. prohib. auctor. Sixti V. & Clem. VIII. observat. circa 4. Regulam.

Q. 12. For what reason is the Scripture thus prohibited among them?

A. Because, (say they,) if it be permitted to be read every where, without difference, there would more pre-

"for novices to learn the Scriptures, that the mind may be "well confirmed in piety, and that they may not be accus-"tomed to human traditions."

The church of Rome hath no more to shew for their holy water, and incensings, and salt, and spittle, &c. than the Pharisees for their traditions: and since they no less impose them as divine than the other, they are alike guilty with them.

R. 10. These apocryphal books were written after prophecy and divine inspiration ceased, and so were not received by the Jewish church, (to whom, 'were committed the oracles of God,' Rom. iii. 2.) nor the Christian church, as the 60th canon of the council of Laodicea shews, where there is a catalogue of the canonical books, without any mention of these.

St. Jerom in prologo proverb. "As therefore the church "doth read Tobias, Judith, and the books of the Macca-"bees, but doth not receive them into the canonical Scrip-"tures: so it doth read the two volumes of Wisdom and "Ecclesiasticus for the edification of the people, not to "establish the authority of ecclesiastical principles." See *Bellarm. de verbo, l.* i. *c.* 10. *init.*

R. 11. Under the law, the people had the Scriptures in a tongue vulgarly known; and they were required to read the law, and to be conversant in it, Deut. vi. 6, 'These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart,' &c. and accordingly our Saviour sends them thither, John v. 39, 'Search the Scriptures.' So St. Paul requires that his 'epistle be read to all the brethren,' 1 Thess. v. 27. and if so, it was written in a language they understood. And so it was in the primitive church; therefore St. Chrysostom exhorts his hearers, though secular men, to provide themselves bibles, the medicines of their souls, to be their perpetual instructers. *Comment. in Colos.* iii. 16.

R. 12. In the Apostles times there were some that 'wrested the Scriptures to their own destruction:' and yet the Apostle thought of no other expedient than to give the Christians a caution, that they were not also led away

judice than profit proceed from it. *Reg. Ind. libr. prohib. Reg.* 4.

Q. 13. Since the Scripture may be misunderstood, have they no judge to determine the sense of it?

A. They say, it belongs to the church (of Rome) to judge of the sense of Scripture, and no one may presume to interpret the Scripture, contrary to the sense which Mother Church hath held and doth hold. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 4. *Decret. de Edit. & usu Script.*

It cannot be called the church of God where the legitimate successor of St. Peter in the Roman chair, and the undoubted vicar of Christ doth not preside:—What the church doth teach is the express word of God, and what is taught against the sense and consent of the church, is the express word of the devil. Cardinal *Hosius de expresso Dei verbo*, p. 642, 643.

SECTION II.—*Of* Repentance *and* Obedience.

Q. 14. What doth the church of Rome teach concerning repentance?

A. 1. It teacheth that contrition, (which is a sorrow for sins past, and a purpose of not committing it for the future,) though perfected with charity, is not sufficient to reconcile a person to God without penance, or confession

with the error of the wicked,' 2 Pet. iii. 16, 17. The way to prevent this, therefore is, not to keep the Scriptures from the people, (which 'were written for our learning,' Rom. xv. 4,) but to exhort them to a diligent perusal of them. Matt. xxii. 29, 'Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures.'

"The sheep should not cast away their skin, because "wolves sometimes hide themselves under it." *St. Austin de Serm. Dom. in monte.*

R. 13. While the apostles were alive, the churches of Christ in matters of dispute, applied themselves to them, as in the point of circumcision, Acts xv. 2; but since they of the church of Rome can never prove the like infallibility in their church, nor direct us where it is, we think ourselves as well in our church, as they can be in theirs; and that as long as we have the Scripture, the church is to be referred to the Scripture, and not the Scripture to the church; and that as the Scripture is the best expounder of itself, so the best way to know whether any thing be of divine authority, is to apply ourselves to the Scripture.

If I would have the church demonstrated, it is not by human teachings, but by the divine oracles. *St. Aug. de unit. Eccles. cap.* 3.

"The way for understanding the Scriptures, is to demonstrate out of themselves, concerning themselves." *Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 7. *p.* 757.

SECTION II.—*Of* Repentance *and* Obedience.

R. 14. Contrition is but another word for repentance, and repentance is a qualification for pardon and reconciliation. 'A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise,' Psalm li. 17. 'Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,' Acts iii. 19. The same texts which make contrition sufficient, without confession

to a priest either in act or desire. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 14. c. 4. *Catech. Rom. pars* 2. *de Sacrament. pœnit. n.* 38.

A. 2. She teacheth that attrition, or imperfect contrition, proceeding merely from the fear of hell, is equivalent to contrition, by virtue of confession: and that attrition doth dispose to receive the grace of the sacrament of penance, and leads to justification. *

* Sess. 14. cap. 4. Bellarm. de pœnit. l. 2. c. 18. ss. Sed sciendum est. [*See Quest.* 77.]

Q. 15. What is the judgment of the church of Rome as to good works?

A. The church of Rome doth affirm that the good works of justified persons do truly deserve eternal life; † and if any one say that such works do not truly deserve an increase of grace here, and eternal life hereafter, let him be accursed. ‡

"Our good works do merit eternal life, not only by virtue "of God's covenant and acceptation, but also by reason of "the work itself. §

† Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. c. 16. ‡ Ibid. Can. 32.
§ Bellarm. de Justif. l. 5. c. 17.

Q. 16. But is there no allowance for such as have not good works of their own, sufficient to merit for themselves?

A. Yes: there are indulgencies to be obtained, by which persons may be discharged from the punishment of sin here and in purgatory: and if any affirm these indulgences to be useless, or that the church hath no power to grant them, he is accursed. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 25. *Decret. de indulg.*

The popes and prelates of the church are judges appointed by God to remit faults aud punishments in his name by an indulgence, if so be justice be satisfied through the application of the satisfaction of Christ and his saints. *Bellarm. de Indulg. l. c.* 1. 5. *ss. Jam vero.*

Q. 17. How far do those indulgences extend?

A. Sometimes to days, sometimes to years, nay some of

to the priest, make attrition insufficient without there be contrition. And as the former doctrine of the insufficiency of contrition without confession, makes that necessary which God hath not made necessary: so this latter of the sufficiency of attrition upon confession to the priest, without contrition, makes that unnecessary which God hath made necessary.

R. 15. Truly to deserve, is to make God our debtor; 'to him that worketh,' (i. e. *that meriteth,)* 'is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt,' Rom. iv. 4. 'But can a man be profitable to God?' Job iv. 4. Our Saviour teaches us otherwise, Luke xvii. 10, 'When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.' A command to do it, and grace to obey that command, and a 'far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory,' *as a reward,* (2 Cor. iv. 17.) will shame the pretence of real merit, and turn the anathema upon themselves. And they may as soon reconcile light and darkness, as the grace of God and merit of Christ to this doctrine.

R. 16. What God binds, no person can untie; and what he unties, no man can bind. But this course of indulgence, still upheld in the church of Rome, doth untie what God doth bind; it makes sin easy and cheap, and prostitutes the strict rules of Christianity to the basest purposes. For when a person can have a plenary indulgence for so trivial a satisfaction as the standing before the doors of St. Peter's church at Rome, when the Pope blesses the people at Easter, it makes sin as easy to be committed as pardoned.

R. 17, 18. The scandal given by them was so notorious, that order was given by the council of Trent for reforming

them were plenary* indulgences; some were for a discharge from punishments here, others from the pains of purgatory, † and some granted an eternal reward.

* Bellarm. de Indulget. l. 1. c. 9. init. *Plenary indulgence doth take away all the punishment due to sin.* Ibid. ss. Indulgentia Quadragen. † Ibid. c. 7. ss. Et quidem.

Q. 18. Upon what terms were those indulgences to be obtained?

A. By money,* pilgrimages, † assisting the pope, ‡ reciting certain prayers. §

* This is implied *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 21. *c.* 9. though it is called by the soft name of alms.

† So many are granted to particular churches in Rome, for the benefit of pilgrims.

‡ So those that upon his motion took up arms against the Albigenses, had by an indulgence the promise of an eternal reward. *Baron. ad A.D.* 1179. *n.* 7.

§ So Pope Alexander VI. granted to those that recited this prayer to the blessed Virgin, and St. Ann her mother, 30,000 years indulgence.

"*Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord be with thee, thy grace with me. Blessed be thou among women: and blessed be St. Ann thy mother, from whom, O Virgin Mary, thou hast proceeded without sin and spot: but of thee hath Jesus Christ been born, the Son of the living God.* Amen." Thesaur. Var. Exercit. in grat. Sodal. *B. V. M.* Bruxel. Edit. 2 An. 1658. p. 287.

Q. 19. Upon what pretence or reason is the doctrine and practice of indulgences founded?

A. Upon works of supererogation,* that is, the overplus of the satisfactions of Christ and the saints, which is a treasury † committed to the church's custody, ‡ and to be disposed of as she sees meet. §

* *That supererogation is necessary to indulgence, no one can deny,* saith Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 2. init.

† Concil. Trid. Sess. 21. c. 9.

‡ So Pope Clem. VI. Constit. extrav. in Bellarm. ibid. § ult.

§ Bellarm. ibid. c. 3.

the abuses of them; but when the fathers thought fit not to discover those abuses, and only forbad wicked gain,* they left a large scope for making a gain of them. And two of the popes under whom that council sat (viz. Paul III. and Julius III. †) proceeded in the same course as their predecessors, if they did not exceed them: for by their bulls, there is granted to all such of the fraternity of the holy altar, as visit the church of St. Hilary of Chartres, during the six weeks of Lent, 775,700 years pardon, besides fourteen or fifteen plenary indulgences. And since that, Urban VIII. ‡ and Clement X. § have granted by their indulgence a plenary remission of sins.

* Sess. 25. Decret. de Indulg.

† *A bull of indulgence to the fraternity of the altar*, Paris 1550. v. B. *Taylor's defence*; part. 2. l. 2. p. 8.

‡ Bullar. to. page 74.

§ A. D. 1671. *Bull upon the canonization of five saints.*

R. 19. Romans viii. 18, 'The sufferings of this present time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us:' so 2 Cor. iv. 17. 'Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God,' Rom. xiv. 12. If there be no comparison betwixt the reward and our sufferings for it, then no one has merit to transfer to another: and if every man must give an account of himself, then no man can be saved by the merits of another. But suppose there is a super-abundance of satisfactions in the saints; yet what need is there of them, when there is such an infinite value in the sufferings of Christ, who 'by one offering hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified,' Heb. x. 14. Or who gave the church the power so to apply them?

Q. 20. Whither do the souls of those go that die in a state of grace, but are not sufficiently purged from their sins, or have not had a plenary indulgence for the remission of them?

A. Such go to purgatory, a place of torment in the other world, near to hell,* where they are to continue till they have made full satisfaction for their sins, and are thoroughly purged and prepared for heaven, whereinto no unclean thing can enter.†

* Bellarm. de Purg. l. 2. c. 6. SS. Quinta est.

† Catech. Rom. par. 1. c. 6. n. 3.

Q. 21. How come those persons to be punished in the other world, who depart in a state of grace out of this?

A. Because they have not here fulfilled the penance imposed upon them, or due from them to God.*

* Bellarm. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 6, 7. *(See Quest.* 91.*)*

Q. 22. Of what continuance is the punishment of that state?

A. It is but for an appointed time; and the person is to continue in it till he is purged from his sin, and has suffered the punishment due to it.

Catch. ibid. Bellarm. de purg. l. 2. c. 8. SS. Quantum ad primum.

R. 20, 21. That those that die in a state of grace, are yet in a state of torment, and are to be purged in the other world, is contrary to Scripture and Antiquity. Rom. viii. 1, 'There is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' Verse 30, 'Whom he justified, them he also glorified.' Verses 33, 34, 'Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?' As justification and condemnation are here opposed by the apostle, so are condemnation and glorification; and he that is justified upon the same reason that he cannot be condemned, shall be glorified. Now the elect are justified before they go out of this world; and consequently shall have nothing laid to their charge in the next.

"The servants of God then have peace, then enjoy quiet "rest and security; when being drawn from these storms "of the world, we arrive at the haven of our everlasting "habitation and security; when this death being ended, we "enter into immortality," *St. Cypr. de Mortal. SS.* 2.

Luke xxiii. 43, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.' Paradise is acknowledged to be the seat of the blessed.* Now if there was a purgation necessary for sinners, he that believed and repented not till the last moment of his life, might be well supposed to need it: and should have been sent rather to purgatory than Paradise.

"After the night of this life there is no purgation; and "it is better to be corrected and purged now, than to be "sent to the torment there, where the time of punishing is, "and not of purging," *Greg. Nazianz. Orat.* 15. *in plag.*

* Bellarm. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 3. Testim. 4.

R. 22. The state that believers immediately enter upon after death, is said to be life for the comfort, and everlasting for the continuance of it.

John v. 24, 'He that believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.'

Q. 23. Is there no way by which the souls of those that are in purgatory may be delivered out of that prison, and their time of torment shortened?

A. They may be helped and delivered by the suffrages* of the faithful that are alive; that is, by prayers, alms, and masses:† and other works of piety, such as indulgences.‡

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25, Decr. de Purgat.
† Sess. 22. Can. 3.
‡ Bellarm. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 16. SS. Ad hæc.

Q. 24. Is the doctrine of purgatory a matter of faith, and necessary to be believed?

A. Yes: for whosoever shall say, that there is no debt of temporal punishment to be paid, either in this world or purgatory, before there can be an admission into heaven, is accursed.* And whosoever shall say, the sacrifice of the mass is not to be used for the dead, is accursed.† This is one of the principles, without the belief of which there is no salvation.‡

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. Can. 30. et Sess. 24. Decret. de Purg.
† Ibid. Sess. 22. Can. 3. ‡ Bulla Pii. 4ti.

So St. Cyprian, "The end of this life being completed, "we are divided into the habitations of everlasting either "death or immortality," Ad Demetr, sec. 16.

R. 23. Luke xvi. 26, 'Betwixt us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you [*to relieve you*] cannot.'

As the state in which Abraham and Lazarus were, needed no relief; so that in which the rich man was, could not obtain it. "After death is no help to be gotten by godli-"ness or repentance. Lazarus doth not there go to the "rich man, nor the rich man unto Lazarus. For the gar-"ners are sealed up, and the time is fulfilled," *Epiphanius contr. Cather. Hœr.* 59.

And if a man's own repentance cannot help him, much less can another's good works profit him.

So St. Jerom: "While we are in this world, we may be "able to help one another, either by our prayers, or by our "counsels: but when we shall come before the judgment "seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can "entreat for any one, but every one must bear his own bur-"den."* And he elsewhere saith, "What shall be to all in "the day of judgment, this is accomplished to every one at "the day of death."†

* Lib. 2. Com. in Galat. c. 6. † In Joel c. 2.

R. 24. Bishop Fisher saith, That there is none or very little mention of purgatory among the ancients.* It is then no little encroachment on the Christian world, to make it now a doctrine of faith, and to require it upon pain of damnation to be believed.

* Roffens Lutheri confut. Art. 18. et Polyd. Virg. de Invent. l. 8. c. 1.

Q. 25. In what place were the souls of the patriarchs, and other good men, before the coming of Christ?

A. Before the death and resurrection,* or ascension of Christ,† the gates of heaven were open to none; and the souls of good men departed, were detained in a certain place called *Limbus Patrum*, which is the uppermost part of hell; the lowermost being the place of the damned; next above that purgatory; next to that *limbus infantum*; above that *limbus patrum*.‡

* Catch. Rom. par. 1. c. 6. n. 3, 6. † Bellarm. de Christ. l. 4. c. 11.
‡ Bellarm. de Purg. l. 2. c. 6. SS. Quod autem.

Q. 26. In what condition were they while thus detained in limbo?

A. They are not agreed in the nature and condition of the place; for the Catechism saith, *N.* 3. "They were sustained by hope, and were without any sense of grief." And presently, *N.* 4. That "although they were without "other sense of grief, yet being kept in suspense, they "were tormented with the hope of that blessed glory which "they did expect."

Q. 27. How and when were they delivered thence?

A. They were delivered by Christ at his descent into hell;* so that, ever since, that place remains empty.†

* Catch. Rom. ibid. n. 5, 6. † Bellarm. de Purg. l. 2. c 6. sec. octava est.

Q. 28. What use do they make of this doctrine?

A. Hereby they give a reason why there is neither precept nor example in the Old Testament for the invocation of saints departed,* because they were for their punishment inclosed in this place, and were there held bound by the devils,† till delivered by Christ. And so the people of those times only prayed to God, and did not use to say, Holy Abraham, pray for me.†

* Bellarm. de Sanct. bear. l. 1. c. 19. sec. Item. Exod.
† Catch. Rom. ibid. n. 5. ‡ Bellarm. ibid.

R. 25. We read that Elijah was taken up into heaven, 2 Kings ii. 11, and he and Moses appeared in glory, Luke ix. 31. Matt. xvii. 2. And Abraham is represented (Luke xvi. 32) as in Paradise, the blessed abode of good men in the other world.

So St. Austin expounds it, "The bosom of Abraham is "the rest of the blessed poor, whose is the kingdom of "heaven, into which after this life they are received," *Quæst. Evangel. l. 2. c.* 38.

R. 26. But the Scripture tells us, that the state where Abraham was, was not only a state of *rest*, but also of *comfort*, Luke xvi. 25.

R. 27. The Scripture says not one word of this.

R. 28. There is neither precept nor example for the invocation of saints in the New Testament; and if that be the reason for a *limbus* before Christ, it may be a reason for a *limbus* still: and they may as well exclude the saints from heaven now as then, if there be no more for their invocation in the New Testament than was in the Old. Thus Salermo, (a learned disputant in the council of Trent,) "Invocations of saints have no express ground in all the "Scriptures."*

* Ad. 1 Tim. ii. Disp. 7. sec. Sed cum ante et nec obstat.

SECT. III.—*Of Divine Worship.*

Q. 29. OF what doth the service in the Roman church consist?

A. It consists of prayers and hymns offered to God, angels, and saints; of lessons taken out of the Scriptures, and legends; and of profession of faith in the creeds.

Q. 30. In what language is their service performed?

A. It is performed in all places among them in the Latin tongue, which is in no place vulgarly understood.

Q. 31. Is the having the service in an unknown tongue enjoined in the church of Rome?

A. Yes: it is required that it should be celebrated in the Latin tongue; and whosoever shall say that it ought only to be administered in the vulgar tongue, is accursed.* Hence when of late years the missal, or mass-book, was translated into French, it was declared by Pope Alexander VII. to be a *seed-plot of disobedience, rashness, and schism;* and he calls them that did it, *sons of perdition,* and doth *condemn, reprobate, and forbid* that missal.

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 23. s. 8. & Can. 9.

Q. 32. What are the objects of worship in the church of Rome?

A. Besides the blessed Trinity, Angels, the Virgin Mary, and Saints.

SECT. III.—*Of Divine Worship.*

R. 29. CARDINAL Quignonius at the instance of Pope Paul III. reformed the breviary; and instead of legends, set scriptures for the lessons. But Pope Pius Quintus, who afterward undertook to reform it also, prohibited that of Quignonius,* and instead of the Scriptures, placed legends again, and so it continues.

* *Bulla prefixa Breviar. Rom. Jussu Pii V. Edit.*

R. 30, 31. In divine worship (as in all other actions) the first thing to be considered is the end, and the next thing is the means conducing to that end. The end is the honour of God, and the edification of the church; and then God is honoured, when the church is edified. The means conducing to that end, are to have the service so administered, as may inform the mind, engage the affections, and increase devotion. But that cannot be done, where the tongue it is celebrated in, is not understood.

Thus we are taught by the apostle, I Cor. xiv. 2, 'He that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men.' Verse 11, 'If I know not the meaning of the voice, he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me.' Verse 16, 'If thou shalt bless with the Spirit [by the gift of an unknown tongue] how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen, at thy giving of thanks?' How can the people be attentive to the lessons, answer at the responses, be devout in the prayers, profess their faith in the creeds, when they do not understand what is read, prayed, or professed? Thus St. Ambrose on 1 Cor. xiv. "It is evident "that the mind is ignorant where the tongue is not understood. The unskilful person hearing what he doth not "understand, knows not the conclusion of the prayer, and "doth not answer Amen."

R. 32. Matt. iv. 10, our Saviour says, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' As divine worship is due to God; so it is not lawful to give it to any other.

Q. 33. What honour do they give to the angels?

A. 1. The church of Rome teaches that angels are to be worshipped,* invoked, and prayed to.† And they have litanies and prayers composed for this purpose.‡

* Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. n. 8, 9, *venerari, adorare, colere.*
† Ibid. n. 10. ‡ Litaniæ ss. Angelorum, vid. Horologium Tutelaris Angeli a Drexelio. p. 84. Cuac 1623.

A. 2. They teach, that as every particular person hath a guardian angel from his birth,* so it is fit to commit themselves more particularly to him;† after this manner, "Blessed angel! to whose care our loving Creator hath committed me, defend me this day, I beseech you, from all dangers, and direct me in the way I ought to walk."‡

* Catech. Rom. par. 4. cap. 9. sec. 1. n. 4. 6. † Horolog. Drex. p. 108.
‡ *The Child's Catechism.* 1678.

Q. 34. What religious honour do they give to the saints?

A. They pray to them as their intercessors, make confessions to them; offer incense, and make vows to them; venerate their images and relics.

Q. 35. For what reason do they pray to saints?

A. That by their help they may obtain benefits from God,* who doth confer many favours upon mankind, by their merit, and grace, and intercession.†

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de invocat. † Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. sec. 12. Missal Rom. proprium Missarum de sanctis.

Q. 36. After what manner do they pray to saints?

A. They pray to them as favourites with God, that they would take them into their protection, and would obtain those things of God for them which they want. Therefore

The church of Rome doth acknowledge this, but says, The worship they give to saints and angels is not of that kind. *Catech. Rom. Part* 3. *c.* 2. *n* 8. *Part* 4. *c.* 6. *n.* 3.

But what worship is peculiar to God, if prayer is not? So thought St. Ambrose, "Thou only art to be invocated." De obitu Theodos.

For God alone can receive our prayer, or can give what we pray for, or be the object of our faith and trust.

R. 33. We honour the holy angels, as they are God's ministers, and are 'sent forth to minister unto them that shall be heirs of salvation,' Heb. i. 14. But to worship or pray to them we dare not, as it is what they themselves refuse and abhor, Rev. xix. 10, and the Scripture doth condemn as 'a sign of a fleshly mind, vainly intruding into those things which we have not seen,' Col. ii. 18. Theodoret upon this text saith, That the practice of worshipping angels continued a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia: wherefore the Synod of Laodicea doth forbid praying to angels: "For Christians ought not to forsake the church of "God, and depart aside and invocate angels, which are "forbidden," *Conc. Laod. Can.* 35.

R. 34, 35, 36, 37, 'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all,' 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

Rom. viii. 34, 'Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right-hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.'

As there is but one God to us, though there are gods many, and lords many, (1 Cor. viii. 5,) so to us there is but one Mediator, or Intercessor, though we should grant there are many intercessors and mediators. For though the angels and saints may intercede for us in heaven, that no more makes them such intercessors as we may pray to, than because there are gods many, we may pray to them, as we do to the true God.

The Scripture knows no difference between a Mediator of intercession and redemption; he alone makes interces-

they plead that they have two different forms of prayer; for God they properly say, *Have mercy upon us, hear us:* to a saint, *Pray for us.* Catech. Rom. par. 4. c. 6. n. 3.

Q. 37. But have they not those forms in their missals, breviaries, and common books of devotion, which are particularly and immediately applied to the saints for obtaining what they want?

A. Yes; it is too manifest to be denied; and though they have been more sparing of late years, yet nothing formerly more frequent. As for instance, in a missal printed at Paris, An. 1520, fol. 51, there is this prayer to St. Agnes.

"O Agnes, woman of the Lamb, do thou enlighten us "within. Destroy the roots of sin, O excellent Lady, after "the grievances of the world do thou translate us to the "company of the blessed."

Q. 38. What is the worship they give to the Virgin Mary?

A. They flee unto her as the advocatrix of the faithful, the mother of God, that by prayer to her they may obtain help, through her most excellent merits with God.

Q. 39. Have they not some singular forms of devotion to her?

A. Yes: for apprehending her to be in glory superior to all created beings, they offer a service to her, beyond what they give either to angels or saints.

Q. 40. After what manner do they apply themselves to her?

A. According to some missals, they ask her to *command her Son, by the right and authority of a mother;** or, as it is in the breviaries used at this day, "Shew thyself a mother."† They pray to her, that she would loose the bands

* Missal. Paris Anno 1520, Folio 65. † Brev. Rom. Fest. Assum.

sion for us, that died and rose, and is at the right-hand of God. And he alone has a right to our prayers, and to him alone we may address them.

So Origen: "All prayers, and supplications, and thanksgivings, are to be sent up to God the Lord of all, by that High Priest, who is above all angels, being the living Word of God." L. 5. cont. Cels. p. 233, 239.

So again: "We ought to pray only to the God over all, "and his only Son the first-born of every creature, who as "our High Priest, offers his prayers to his God, and our "God." Lib. 8. p. 395, 402.

To have other mediators and intercessors, is not to hold the head, (Colos. ii. 19,) in the judgment of the apostle, and the council of Laodicea, where it is said, "Christians "ought not to forsake the church, and invocate angels.—If "any man therefore be found to give himself to this privy "idolatry, let him be anathema; because he hath forsaken "our Lord Jesus, the Son of God, and betaken himself to "idolatry."

R. 38. We honour this blessed virgin as the mother of the holy Jesus, and as she was a person of eminent piety; but we do not think it lawful to give that honour to her, which belongs not to a creature, and doth equal her with her Redeemer.

R. 39, 40. We cannot but wonder at the applications made to the blessed Virgin in the church of Rome, whose acts on earth, and whose power in heaven, the Scripture doth very sparingly relate, or is altogether silent in. We read nothing there of her bodily assumption into heaven, nor of her exaltation to a throne above angels and archangels.* We read nothing there of her being the mother of grace and mercy,† the queen and gate of heaven, the advocatrix of sinners,‡ and of her power in destroying all heresies in the world,§ and being all things to all.‖

* Brev. Rom. Æstiv. Fest. Assump.

† Officium parvum B. M. ad Matutin. } Catech. par 4.
‡ Completor. } c. 5. n. 8.

§ Fest. Assump. ‖ Missale Paris. ibid. et Le Psaultier de Jesus. Paris. 1620. p. 126.

of the guilty, bring light to the blind, would make them mild and chaste, and cause their hearts to burn in love to Christ.*

* Officium. B. M. in the hymn called Planctus B. M. Antwerp, 1641.

In a book printed lately in London, the author saith, that "whatever gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive "them by the mediation of Mary. No one being gracious "to Jesus that is not devoted to Mary. That the power of "Mary in the kingdom of Jesus, is suitable to her mater-"nity."—"And though the condition of some great sin-"ners may be so deplorable, that the limited excellency "and merits cannot effectually bend the mercies of Jesus "to relieve them; yet such is the acceptableness of the "mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whosoever is under the "verge of her protection, may confide in her intercession "to Jesus." "That the person devoted to her, is to beg "of her to accompany him as his sacred guide, advocate, "and champion, against the assaults of sin and sensuality."

* Contemplations of the life and glory of holy Mary, &c. p. 7, 8, 9, 14. Printed Anno 1685.

Much after the fore-cited manner did the council of Constance invoke the blessed Virgin, as other councils used to do the Holy Ghost, calling her the *mother of grace, the fountain of mercy;* and they call on her for *light from heaven.*

Q. 41. What external representations or memorials have they in the church of Rome, which they give veneration and worship to?

A. They have the relics and images of the Virgin Mary and saints. Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de invoc.

Q. 42. What do they mean by relics?

A. The bodies or remainders of them, or particular things belonging or relating to them when alive, as an arm, or

When we read so much of the blessed Virgin in books of this kind, and so little of her in the divine writings, we cannot but reflect upon what is said by Epiphanius, of a certain sect of women that in his time offered cakes to the Virgin Mary, which he calls an impious thing, and altogether "contrary to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost."* And he further adds; "This the Holy Ghost doth warn us of, "in that Christ saith, Woman, what have I to do with "thee? Where he calls her woman, and as it were prophe-"sying, to refute those schisms and heresies which he knew "would arise in the world; and that no one, being moved "by a certain admiration of the blessed Virgin, might turn "himself to those dotages of heresies." And he adds, "Let the Virgin Mary be honoured, but the Father, Son, "and Holy Ghost, be adored."† Much more hath that father there to this purpose.

* Hæres. 78. p. 1054. Par. 1622. † Hæres. 79. N. 4, 7. &c.

But what would this father have said, if, instead of a chair adorned and set forth in honour of the Virgin Mary, (as those women did,) he had found her advanced to a throne of a mediatrix in heaven? What if instead of cakes, there had been litanies and prayers offered to her, and that in more abundance than to Christ himself? What if he had found them praying, *O holy mother, succour the miserable, help the weak, comfort those that mourn?* (Breviar. Rom. Æstiv. Suffragia.) I doubt not but he would have said of this, what he doth of the other; that they would obtrude her upon us for God, and have called it heresy and idolatry.

R. 41, 42. Deut. xxxiv. 6, 'He [God by Michael] buried Moses, but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.' S. Barradas the Jesuit upon the place saith, "It is the com-"mon opinion of Lyra, Abulensis, Cajetan, and others, that "the sepulchre was hid, lest the Israelites, who were in-"clined to the worship of idols, should worship Moses as "God. For they say that when the devil would for that "reason have shewed the grave and the body of Moses to "the Israelites, St. Michael hindered; and this was the con-

thighs, bones, or ashes;* and the part in which they suffered,† or the things by which they suffered, as the chains with which St. Peter was bound.§

* Ex Decret. Regist. Præfix. Brev. Rom.
† Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. n. 15.
§ Brev. Rom. par. Æstiv. Aug. Fest. Petri. ad vinc.

Q. 43. For what cause do they shew this regard to relics?

A. By the veneration of them they obtain the help of the saints,* whom the relics relate to; and many benefits are thereby conferred by God upon mankind; for by these the dead have been raised, the infirm cured, and devils cast out.†

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de invocat.
† Catech. Rom. ibid. Breviar. Rom. ibid.

Q. 44. What kind of reverence or worship is required to be given to images and pictures in the church of Rome?

A. They kiss them, uncover the head, and fall down before them; offer incense, and pray to them, and use all such postures of worship as they would do to the person or persons thereby represented, (whether Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other saints,) if they were present: and whosoever doth think otherwise is accursed.* And accordingly the priest is to direct the people to them, that they may be worshipped.†

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de invocat. Catech. Rom. Par. 4. c. 6. n. 4.
† Colantur Catech. Rom. Par. 3. c. 2. n. 31.

"tention spoken of Jude 9." Seb. Barrad. Itinerar. Fil. Israel.

They could give no greater honour to the body of Moses, than is given to relics in the church of Rome; and if that was idolatry, and Moses's body was concealed to prevent it, then there is as much reason to think it unlawful now in this case, as it was then in that.

R. 43. We read of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xviii. 4, that he brake in pieces the Brazen Serpent that Moses had made; and the reason was, because the children of Israel did burn incense to it. The brazen serpent was of God's own institution, Numb. xxi. 8. By looking up to which, the people were formerly cured. And though it was preserved as a memorial of that divine operation; yet when abused to idolatry, he cut it in pieces. And were these truly relics of saints, and did work those miracles they pretend, it would be no reason for that reverence and worship they give to them; but the reverence and worship given to them should, according to good king Hezekiah's practice, be a reason to give them a decent interment.

R. 44. On the contrary, the second commandment teaches us, 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, &c. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them.' In which there are two words to be considered, the one, *pesel*, which we rightly translate *graven image*; for it properly signifies any thing carved and cut out of wood or stone; and so it is about forty times rendered in the Greek translation (γλυπτον) *a graven thing*. So that an idol and an image are there forbidden. The next word is *themunah*, which doth properly signify a *similitude* or *likeness*, (as is confessed,) and is always so translated. And thus it was understood by the fathers. So Justin Martyr when he recites this law, saith, God forbad *every image and similitude*. [εικονα και ομοιωμα.] And therefore Cassander grants that the ancient Christians *abhorred all veneration of images*. Consult. Art. 21. de Imagin. Indeed the command is so express against this practice, that there has been a kind of self-condemnation in

Q. 45. What do they profess, is their intention in the reverence they give to images and pictures?

A. They declare that the honour given to images and pictures, is referred to the prototypes,* or the persons represented by them, whether God the Father, Christ, angels, or saints: and when they fall down before the image or picture, they worship God, or Christ, the angel, or saint.

* Concil. Trid. Ibid.

Q. 46. What regard have they to the material cross or crucifix?

A. 1. They ascribe peculiar virtue to it, and pray that God would make the wood of the cross to "be the stability "of faith, an increase of good works, the redemption of "souls." *Pontificale in bened. novæ Crucis.*

2. They use all expressions of outward adorations, by kissings, and prostrations, &c. †

3. They pray directly to it, to "increase grace in the godly, and blot out the sins of the guilty." ‡

4. They give *latria* to it, which is the sovereign worship that is peculiar to God. §

† Missale Fer. 6. in Parasc.

‡ Ibid. sub ante Domin. pass. & Fest. invent. crucis.

§ Pontif. Rom. ordo ad recep. Imper. Rubr. 1. & Gretser de cruce, l. 1. c. 49.

the church of Rome; whilst they commonly either altogether leave out this commandment, * or render it imperfectly and by halves, *Thou shalt not make to thee an idol.*

* The Children's Catechism, printed 1678.

R. 45. If an image be a representation of a divine person, and worship be due to the image for the sake of the person represented in it; then such as the person is, such must the worship be that is due to his image; and what is due to the person if present, is due to the image in his absence. For to give one honour to the person, and another to the image, a superior to the person, and an inferior to the image, is to terminate the worship in the image, and not pass it from thence to the person, as Gretser the Jesuit argues: * but if it be to pass from the image unto the person, then we know what they do when they kiss, and uncover their heads, and bow down to, and worship an image: and have reason to remember the apostle's advice, 1 John v. 21, 'Keep yourselves from idols.'

* De cruce, l. i. c. 49. § *Secundo itaque.*

R. 46. The church of Rome, though without any authority from Scripture, (which uses the words promiscuously,) † makes a distinction between *latria* and *doulia;* the former is the worship they give to God, the latter the worship they give to saints. Now they grant, that to give *latria*, or sovereign worship to any besides God, is idolatry; and that were not the host the very body and blood of Christ, it would be no less than idolatry to give that honour to the host, which they give to Christ: we understand then how to call that worship they give to the cross; they themselves call it *latria;* so we may by their leave call it idolatry. For whatever the host is, the cross is but a representation, and not the person worshipped.

† Gal. iv. 8. ἐδουλεύσατε, *Ye did service to them that were no gods.* Rom. i. 25. ἐλατρεύσαν, *They served the creature.*

Q. 47. Do they think it lawful to represent God and the blessed Trinity by pictures and images, and to worship them?

A. Such pictures are not only almost every where received in the church of Rome, but universally tolerated, * and are both recommended as expedient for the people, † and proposed to them to be worshipped. ‡

* Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. c. 8. § ultimo probatur.
† Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de sacr. Imag. Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. p. 20.
‡ Cajetan. in Aquin. q. 25, art. 3.

Q. 48. Upon what pretence do they make such representations of God?

A. They say, they hereby represent not God, but some of his properties and actions, after the manner they are described in Scripture: as when Dan. vii. 9, 10, 'The Ancient of days' is said 'to sit on a throne, having the books opened before him:' thereby signifying his eternity and infinite wisdom. *

* Catech. Rom. Ibid.

Q. 49. But are not such descriptions of God, the way to represent him, as if he was like unto one of us?

A. Such pictures are not without danger to be exposed to such as cannot read the Scriptures, if they are not taught that they are to be taken metaphorically †.

† Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. c. 8. SS. Respondent.

R. 47. There is nothing more expressly forbidden in Scripture, than the making any image or representation of God, Deut. iv. 15, 16, 'Take ye good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude,) lest ye corrupt yourselves; and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure.' If it had been acceptable to God, he would have chosen a similitude to appear in; but seeing he did not, they were not to presume to make one for him. This is to *change his glory*, Rom. i. 21, &c. And "to place "such an image in a Christian temple is abominable," saith St. Austin. * And "thus to describe the Trinity, is a de-"formation of it," saith Cassander. †

* De Fide & Symb. c. 7. † Art. 21. § de Imag.

R. 48. But what is this to those images and pictures used by them, which have no resemblance in Scripture; such are their descriptions of the Trinity in Unity, as of God the Father like an old Man, having the Son lying in his bosom, the Holy Ghost over his head like a dove?

2. God himself never appeared in any form, and so the resemblance in Daniel was only a prophetical scheme, and did no more belong to God, than the eyes and ears that are ascribed to him in Scripture.

3. God cannot be represented at all, but by such properties and effects: but if an image of God be forbidden to be worshipped, then the image, even by such properties and effects, is forbidden to be worshipped.

R. 49. Cassander saith, "I wish those from whom this "information is to be received, were not the authors of "these superstitions;" and he adds, "That the teaching "is not enough, without the occasions be removed." This he saith of all images, but more especially of such as are made to represent God. *Art.* 21. *de Imag.*

SECTION IV.—*Of the Sacraments.*

Q. 50. What is a Sacrament?

A. A Sacrament is a sensible thing which, by the institution of God, hath a power, as well of causing as of signifying holiness and righteousness. *

Q. 51. How many sacraments are there in the church of Rome?

A. There are seven, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony. †

Q. 52. Is this number determined to be a matter of faith?

A. Whosoever saith, that there are more or fewer than seven instituted by Christ; or that any of the seven are not truly and properly sacraments, is accursed. ‡

* Catech. Rom. par. 2. cap. 1. n. 11.
† Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 1. ibid. ‡ Ibid.

Q. 53. What are the parts of a sacrament?

A. The parts of a sacrament are the matter or element, and the form of words of consecration: so the matter in Baptism is water; the form is, *I baptize thee, &c.*

Q. 54. Of what virtue are the sacraments?

A. The sacraments contain the grace which they signify, and confer grace, *(ex opere operato)*, by the work itself, upon such as do not put an obstruction. * For these sensible and natural things work by the almighty power of God in the sacraments, what they could not do by their own power. †

* Concil. Trid. ibid. Can. 6. & 8. † Catech. Rom. ibid. n. 27.

Q. 55. What is necessary to a sacrament on the part of those that officiate?

SECTION IV.—*Of the* SACRAMENTS.

R. 50, 51, 52. CASSANDER saith, that we shall not easily find any before Peter Lombard, who lived about 1139, that did define the number of the sacraments. * And St. Austin is very positive that there are but two of divine institution.† Now that there should be sacraments of divine institution, that are neither instituted in the gospel, nor known to be so, till 1100 years after our Saviour, nor be made a matter of faith till 1500, may be a doctrine received in the church of Rome, but will not easily be believed by any out of it.

* Art. 13. § de num. Sacram.

† Epist. ad Januar. 118. *Our Lord Jesus Christ, saith he, hath knit Christians together, with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as are Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*

R. 53. That a sacrament should consist of matter and form, and yet either have no form, as Confirmation and extreme Unction; or have neither matter nor form, of divine institution, as Penance and Matrimony; is to make them sacraments, and to be none. Our church rightly affirms of the additional sacraments, they have not any visible sign ordained of God, Article 25.

R. 54. It is not sufficient that adult persons have no indisposition to receive the grace of the sacraments; for there is also required a mind well instructed, a sound belief, and a heart well inclined for that purpose. 2. The virtue in the sacraments doth not proceed from the mere elements and words, but from the blessing of God in consequence of his promise to such only as rightly partake of them, and are qualified for it.

R. 55. From hence it follows, that if there be no intention, the sacraments are none. And so there is no cer-

A. It is absolutely necessary, that those that make and consecrate the sacraments, have an intention of doing at least what the church doth, and doth intend to do. *Conc. Trid. ibid. can.* 11.

Of Baptism.

Q. 56. Who may administer the sacrament of Baptism?

A. It chiefly belongs to bishops, priests, and deacons, but in case of necessity men or women, Jews, Infidels, or Heretics may do it, if they intend to do what the church doth.

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 2. de bapt. can. 4.

† Catech. Rom. par. 2. c. 2. n. 24.

Q. 57. What ceremonies are used in the administration of Baptism in the church of Rome?

A. Before baptism, there is, 1. Chrism or oil mixed with water in the consecration of it. *

2. Exorcism composed of certain words, prayers, and actions, for driving away the devil † out of the child, and the salt, &c. And the priest is to blow in the face of the child, after the form of a cross, saying, *Go out of him*, Satan, &c. ‡

3. The forehead, eyes, breast, &c. are to be crossed, to shew that by the mystery of baptism, the senses are opened to receive God, and to understand his commands, *Cate. n.* 67. *Pastor ibid.*

4. Then some exorcised salt is to be put into the mouth, to signify a deliverance from the putrefaction of sin, and the savour of good works. § And the priest in putting it into the mouth, saith, N. *Take the salt of wisdom, and let it be a propitiation for thee to eternal life.* Amen. ‖

5. Then the nose and ears are to be anointed with spittle, and then the child is to be brought to the water, as the

* Catech. ibid. n. 11. & 60. † Catech, ibid. n. 65. ‡ Pastorale Antwerp. 1625. § Catech. ibid. n. 66. ‖ Pastor. ibid.

tainty whether the priest be a priest, or whether in the eucharist the elements continue not elements after consecration, and what is taken for the host be no other than bread. For without the intention, neither is the priest ordained, nor are the elements consecrated.

Of Baptism.

R. 56. Our Saviour gave commission to the apostles and their successors in the office of the ministry, 'to teach all nations, baptizing them,' Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. So that women, Jews, and Infidels, have no more a power to administer baptism, than they have to teach, or to be priests.

R. 57. It is pleaded for these ceremonies, that they are appointed for the majesty of divine worship, and that the benefits contained in the sacraments, may be better imprinted on the mind. *Catech. part* 2. *c.* 2. *n.* 59.

But can we think it for the majesty of baptism to have it dressed up like a form of conjuration, that the child must be supposed to be possessed with the devil, and the priest must blow in his face three times, with *get thee out, Satan*, before he can say, *Peace be with thee;* and that he must cross him half a score times or more, from part to part, in preparation to baptism?

Can we think it for the majesty of it, to have salt exorcised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to be put into the mouth of the child, *for a propitiation unto eternal life?* Can we think it for the majesty of this ordinance, that the priest should put some of his own spittle in his left-hand, and then taking it thence with the thumb and fore-finger of his right-hand, touch both ears of the infant, and say, *Ephphatha, be thou opened:* and then his nostrils, and say, *For the odour of sweetness; but thou, O devil, fly:* and then on his right-hand, after the manner of a cross, saying, N. *I deliver unto thee, the mark*

blind man to Siloam, to signify it brings light to the mind. *Catech. ibid. n.* 60.

After baptism, 1. The priest anoints the top of the head with chrism, * and he adds, *Let him anoint thee with the chrism of salvation.* †

2. He puts a white garment on the baptized, saying, *Take this white garment, which thou mayest bring before the judgment seat of Christ, that thou mayest have life eternal.* Catech. ibid. n. 73.

3. A lighted candle is put into the hand, to shew a faith inflamed with charity, and nourished with good works. *Ibid. n.* 74.

* Catech. ibid. n. 72. † Pastor. ibid.

Of CONFIRMATION.

Q. 58. Is Confirmation a sacrament?

A. It is properly and truly, and whosoever holds otherwise is accursed. *

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. de confirm. Can. 1.

Q. 59. What is the matter of the sacrament of confirmation?

A. The matter is chrism, which is an ointment com-

†

of our Lord Jesus Christ, † *that thou mayest drive the adversary from thee on every side, and have life eternal?*

And what are the benefits imprinted on the mind by these fantastical ceremonies? Or when is it such benefits are promised as these are said to signify? Is it not rather a debasing of it, to have such rites and prayers introduced into it, as signify that which baptism was never appointed for? To give an instance in the salt used in it.

The EXORCISM *of the* SALT.

"I exorcise thee, O creature of salt, in the name of the "Father † omnipotent, and in the love of our Lord Jesus "† Christ, and in the virtue of the Holy † Spirit. I exor-"cise thee by the living † God, by the true † God, by the "holy † God, who hath created thee for the safeguard of "mankind, and hath commanded it to be consecrated by "his servants for the people that come to believe, that in "the name of the holy Trinity thou be'st made a whole-"some sacrament to put the enemy to flight. Therefore we "pray thee, O our Lord God, that in sanctifying † thou dost "sanctify this creature of salt, and in blessing † thou dost "bless it, that it may be a perfect medicine to all that "take it."

N. B. Where this mark † stands, the sign of the cross is made.

Of CONFIRMATION.

R. 58. THE Roman catechism saith, That sacraments cannot be instituted by any but God. * And yet the great schoolman Alex. Ales saith, "Christ did not institute nor "declare confirmation to be a sacrament." † So by their own confession it is none.

* Catech. ibid. n. 6. † Par. 4. Q. 4. M. 1.

R. 59. That chrism is either of divine institution or the matter of a sacrament may be said, but cannot be proved.

pounded of oil olive, and balsam, and consecrated by the bishop,* upon Maunday Thursday.†

* Catech. Rom. par 2. c. 3. n. 2, 7, and 27.
† Sum of Christian doctrine, Lond. 1686.

Q. 60. What is the form of consecration?

A. The form is the words used by the bishop, when he crosses the forehead with the chrism, viz. "I sign thee "with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the "chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, Son, and "Holy Ghost." *Catech. n.* 2. & 11.

Q. 61. What ceremonies are used in confirmation?

A. In the anointing, the bishop dips the tip of his finger in the chrism, and making a cross, saith, *I sign thee*, &c.*

2. After confirmation, he strikes the person slightly on the cheek, that he may remember he is to suffer all injuries for the name of Christ, with patience and courage.†

3. Then the person to be confirmed setting his foot upon the right foot of the godfather,‡ is to have his head bound with a clean head-band for some days, more or less, with reverence to the holy chrism; which done, the band is to be preserved in the *sacrarium*, or other clean place till the following Ash-Wednesday, to be burnt to holy ashes.§

* Pontif. de Confirm. † Catech. n. 25. ‡ Pontif. ibid.
§ Pastorale.

Of the EUCHARIST.

Q. 62. What is the Eucharist?

A. It is a sacrament wherein is truly and substantially contained whole Christ, God-man, body and blood, bones and nerves,* soul and divinity, under the species or appearance of bread and wine.†

* Catech. Rom. par. 2. c. 4. n. 33. † Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. de real. præs. c. 1.

R. 60. It is said that Christ instituted the matter and form of confirmation from the authority of pope Fabian; * but Alex. Ales saith, it was ordained by the Meldensian council. † And indeed the Roman catechism, after some pretence to divine institution, thinks it safest to resolve it into the authority of the church.

* Par. 4. Q. 2. M. 2. N. 3. & Q. 9. M. 1.
† Catech. Rom. ibid. N. 6. & 19. & Bellarminus de confirm. c. 2.

R. 61. Whether we consider the far fetched significations of these ceremonies, or the virtue put in them; the abuse is intolerable; as for instance, that in consecration of the chrism, the bishop blows upon it, to signify the descent of the Holy Ghost for the sanctification of it, ‡ and that it hath a power of sanctification as the instrument of God.‖ So the bishop prays in the consecration of it, "That God "in bestowing spiritual grace upon this ointment, would "pour out the fulness of sanctification, and that it may be "to all that are to be anointed with it, for the adoption of "sons by the Holy Spirit. § Amen."

‡ Bellarm. de confirm. l. 2. c. 13. § Tertio habet.
‖ Ibid. § Quarta cæremonia.
§ Pontif. Rom.

Of the Eucharist.

R. 62, 63. No such change of the substance of the bread; (1.) into the substance of Christ's body, can be inferred from our Saviour's words, *This is my body*, Matt. xxvi. 26, for it is not said this is turned into my body, but *This is my body;* which if to be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. Therefore cardinal Cajetan acknowledges it is no where

Q. 62. How do they attempt to prove this?

A. From the words of our Saviour, *This is my body:* which, say they, clearly demonstrate, that the same body which was born of the Virgin, and is now in heaven, is in the sacrament. *Catech. par.* 2. *c.* 4. *n.* 26.

A Sum of Christian Doctrine, printed 1686.

Q. 63. What becomes of the bread and wine after consecration?

A. Upon consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread, into the substance of Christ's body; and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of Christ's blood; which conversion is usually called transubstantiation. *C. Trid. ibid. c.* 4. *Concil. Later.* 4. *Can.* 1.

Q. 64. What is then that, which is seen and tasted in the eucharist?

A. The things seen and tasted are the accidents only of bread and wine; there is the savour, colour, and quantity of bread and wine, without any of their substance; but under those accidents there is only the body and blood of Christ. *Catech. Rom. n.* 37 & 44.

Q. 65. Is the body and blood of Christ broken, when the host is broken and divided?

A. No, because Christ is impassible; † and besides there is whole and entire Christ under either species or element, under the species of bread, and under every particle of it; under the species of wine, and under every drop of it. ‡

† Abridgment of Christ. Doctrine, c. 11. § Euchar.

‡ Conc. Trid. ibid. c. 3.

said in the gospel, that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; but they have it from the authority of the church. *Cajet. in Aquin. 3 par. Q. 75. art.* 1.

2. It is farther evident that the words are not to be taken in their proper sense; for it is called bread as well after consecration as before it, 1 Cor. x. 17. xi. 26, 27, 28. So that what was called his body was also bread at the same time.

3. The mystical relation which the bread by consecration has to Christ's body, is sufficient to give it the name of his body. For it is the usual way of Scripture, to call things of a sacramental nature, by the name of those things they are the figure of.* So circumcision is called the covenant, Gen. xvii. 13. And the killing, dressing, and eating the Lamb is called the passover, Exodus xii. 11. And after the same manner is the bread in the sacrament Christ's body; that is, as circumcision was the covenant, and the Lamb the passover, by signification and representation, by type and figure. And so the elements are called by the fathers, *The images*,† *the symbols*,‡ *the figure*,§ of Christ's body and blood.

* Aug. Epist. 23. † Orig. dial. 3. contr. Marcion. ‡ Euseb. dem. Evang. l. 1. c. & ult. § Aug. contr. Adimant. c. 12.

R. 64. Our Saviour appealed to the senses of his disciples, Luke xxiv. 39, 'Handle and see me, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have." Take away the certainty of sense, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit; and grant transubstantiation, and we take away the certainty of sense.

R. 65. If every particle of the host is as much the whole body of Christ, as the whole host is before it be divided, then a whole may be divided into wholes; for divide it and sub-divide it, it is still whole. Whole it is before the division, whole it is in the division, and whole it is after it. Thus unreasonable, as well as false, is the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Q. 66. Do they administer the sacrament in both kinds of bread and wine?

A. No, the people are permitted to receive it only in one kind, and are denied the cup. *Trid. Sess.* 21. *c.* 1.

Q. 67. For what reason doth the church of Rome deprive the people of what our Lord is granted to have instituted?

A. For *just and weighty* causes, * such as these, 1. Lest the blood of Christ should be spilt upon the ground, 2. Lest the wine by being kept for the sick, should grow eager, 3. Because many cannot bear the taste or smell of wine. 4. Because in many countries, there is such a scarcity of wine as is not to be had without great charge and tedious journeys. 5. To disprove those that deny whole Christ to be contained under each species. †

* Con. Trid. ibid. c. 2. † Catech. Rom. ibid. n. 66.

Q. 68. What is the mass?

A. In the sacrifice of the mass, the same Christ is contained, and unbloodily offered, who bloodily offered himself upon the altar of the cross. *Conc. Trid. Sess.* 22. *c.* 1.

Q. 69. Of what virtue is the sacrifice in the mass?

A. It is truly a propitiatory sacrifice, and is available, not only for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions of the living, but also for those of the souls in purgatory. *Ibid.*

Q. 70. Is this necessary to be believed?

A. Yes, and whosoever denies any of this is accursed, * and incapable of salvation. †

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 1. † Bulla Pii 4.

R. 66. It is acknowledged, that our Saviour instituted and delivered the sacrament in both kinds. * And that it so continued even in the church of Rome for above 1000 years after. † And yet with a *non obstante* to both, they forbid the people to drink of it; and declare, whoever thinks it necessary to receive in both kinds, is accursed? ‡

* Concil. Constant. Sess. 13.—Trid. Sess. 21. c. 1, 2.
† Consult. Cassandri. Art. 22.
‡ Concil. Trid. ibid. Can. 1.

R. 67. These are *the just and weighty causes* for their over-ruling the plain precept of our Saviour, Matt. xxvi. 27, *Drink ye all of this;* and yet whosoever shall say they are not just and sufficient reasons, is accursed.§ As if it was sufficient to forbid wine in the sacrament to all, because some few cannot bear the taste or smell of it; and it was a just cause to deprive all countries of it, because some have not wine, or cannot obtain it without difficulty!

§ Concil. Trid. ibid. Can. 2.

R. 68, 69, 70. The Scripture, when it extols the perfection and infinite value of Christ's sacrifice, doth infer from it, that there needed not therefore any repetition of it. Heb. vii. 27, 'He needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifice, &c. for this he did once, when he offered up himself.' But if the same Christ is offered in the mass as was on the cross, and that unbloody sacrifice is alike propitiatory as the bloody, there is then a repetition of the same sacrifice, and he is daily offered. And what is it to say the one was bloody and the other is unbloody, when the unbloody is of the same virtue, and is applied to the same end as the bloody? So that as if Christ had again been bloodily offered up, there had been a repetition of that sacrifice; so there is a repetition of it when he is offered up unbloodily. To have then a perfect sacrifice daily repeated, and a sacrifice without suffering, and a

Q. 71. May the priest communicate alone, though there be none besides to communicate?

A. Yes, the church of Rome doth approve and commend solitary masses, and accounts them a communion; partly, because the people do spiritually communicate in it, and partly because it is celebrated by a public minister, not only for himself, but also for the people. *Conc. Trid. ibid. cap.* 6.

Q. 72. What honour is to be given to the consecrated host?

A. *Latria*, or the same sovereign worship which is due only to God,* adore it; † pray to it. ‡ And whosoever holds it unlawful or idolatrous so to do, is accursed. §

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. cap. 5. † Missale Rom. Can. Missæ.
‡ Brev. Rom. Hym. in F. Corp. Ch. § Concil. Trid. ibid. Can. 6.

Q. 73. What are the ceremonies used in the mass?

A. The ceremonies in the mass, respect either things, actions, or words; among the things, are garments, places, time, vessels, cloths, incense, lights, &c. *Bellarm. Doc. Trid. de Sacr. Miss.*

Q. 74. What are the garments used by the priest in the mass, and what is their signification?

A. 1. The amice or white veil, which he puts over his head, signifies mystically, either the divinity of Christ, covered under his humanity, or the crown of thorns; and morally, contemplation or hope. In putting it on, he saith, "Put on, O Lord, the helmet of salvation upon my head, "that I may overcome all diabolical temptations."

2. The alb or long white garment, signifies mystically, the white robe put on our Saviour; and, morally, faith and innocency. In putting it on, he saith, "Make me white, O

propitiation and remission without blood, are alike irreconcilable to the apostle, Heb. ix. 22, 25, &c.

R. 71. The apostle calls the Lord's supper a communion, and saith, 'all are partakers of that one bread,' 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. And Cassander saith, "It cannot properly be a "communion unless many partake of it;" and adds from the council of Nantz, That it is absurd to say, "Lift up your hearts," when there is none communicates with the priest.* And yet the council of Trent declares, whosoever shall say such masses are unlawful, and to be abrogated, is accursed.†

* Consult. Art. 24. de solit. Miss. † Sess. 22. Can. 8.

R. 72. We freely own that Christ is to be adored in the Lord's supper; but that the elements are to be adored, we deny. If Christ is not corporally present in the host, they grant their adoration to be idolatry.‡ And that he is not corporally present any where but in heaven, we are taught, Acts i. 11. iii. 21, whither he went, and where he is to continue till his second coming to judgment.

‡ Coster. Enchir. c. 8. n. 10.

R. 73, 74. The council of Trent saith, that the ceremonies of the mass, such as mystical benedictions, lights, incensings, garments, &c. are from apostolical tradition,* or as others, were instituted by the Holy Ghost:† and that they serve for the majesty of that sacrifice, and to raise the mind to the contemplation of the divine things concealed in it; so none of them are superfluous and vain.‡

* Sess. 22. c. 5. † Bellarm. cap. de Sacr. Mis. ‡ Catech. par. 2. c. 4. n. 81.

But how shall we reconcile this to the numerous crossings and sprinklings, used in the celebration of the mass? For example, When the priest is clothed with the garments, rehearsed before, he comes to the altar, and standing on the lowest step just against the middle of it, he makes a profound reverence to the altar and crucifix. Then he ascends, and having placed the books, &c. in order, he

"Lord, and cleanse my heart, that being whitened in the "blood of the Lamb, I may enjoy everlasting gladness."

3. The girdle signifies mystically the cords wherewith our Saviour was bound; and morally, (being turned up on both sides,) the two means to preserve chastity, viz. fasting and prayer. When he puts it about him, he prays, "Gird "me, O Lord, with the girdle of purity, and quench in "my loins the humour of lust, that there may remain in me "the virtue of continency and chastity." The like account is given of the maniple, vestment, and stole, and of the divers colours of the furniture used in the several seasons, in the *manual of the poor man's devotion*, Chap. Of the Ornaments of the Mass.

Of Penance.

Q. 75. What is the matter and form of the sacrament of penance?

A. The matter is contrition, confession, and satisfaction. The form is, *I absolve. Catech. Rom. par* 2. *c.* 5. *n.* 14. & 15.

Q. 76. What is confession?

A. Confession is a particular discovery of all mortal sins to the priest, with all their circumstances that increase or diminish the sin, as far as can be called to mind; * without which, neither forgiveness nor salvation is to be obtained.†

* Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. c. 5. & Catech. ibid. n. 48.

† Trid. ibid. Can. 6, 7. Catech. n. 44.

descends to the lowest step, and turning himself to it, with his hands joined before his breast, and making a reverence to the altar or crucifix, he begins the mass standing upright, and drawing with his right-hand (his left-hand laid on his breast) the sign of the cross from his forehead to his breast. Then he joins his hands before his breast; the minister standing on his left-hand behind him bowing, saith *Ad Deum*, &c. Then the priest with the minister say the psalm, *Judica me*, with *Gloria Patri*, at which he is to bow his head to the cross. Then he repeats the *Introibo*, making with his right-hand the sign of the cross from the forehead to the breast. Then he bows his head and body to the altar, and there he stands bowing till the minister saith *misereatur*. When he saith *mea culpa*, he smites thrice upon his breast with the right-hand; and thus the missal proceeds in its ceremonies in all the remaining parts of the service.

Of Penance.

R. 75. We are told, that the matter of a sacrament is somewhat sensible: * then how is penance a sacrament which has no such matter? For where is the matter that is sensible in contrition? The council to avoid this, call it *Quasi materia, a matter after a sort.* †

* Catech. Rom. par. 2. c. 1. n. 11. † Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. cap. 3.

R. 76. We grant confession to men to be in many cases of use, public in case of public scandal; private to a spiritual guide for disburthening of the conscience, and as an help to repentance. But to make auricular confession, or particular confession to a priest, necessary to forgiveness and salvation, when God has not so made it, is apparently to teach for doctrine the commandment of men; and to make it necessary in all cases, is to make of what may be a useful means, a dangerous snare, both to the confessor and those that confess.

Q. 77. Of what kind is the absolution, which the priest grants upon confession?

A. The absolution is not only declarative, but judicial, and the sentence pronounced by the priest, is as if pronounced by the Judge himself; * he perfecting what God causes. †

* Concil. Trid. ibid. c. 6. & Can. 9. † Catech. par. 2. 5. n. 17.

Q. 78. What is the benefit of absolution?

A. Although a sinner is not so affected with such grief for his sin, as may be sufficient to obtain pardon; yet when he has rightly confessed to a priest, all his sins are pardoned, and an entrance is opened into heaven. *Catech. ibid. n.* 38.

Q. 79. What is satisfaction?

A. It is a compensation made to God, by prayer, fasting, alms, * &c. for all offences committed against him; † so that the offender is thereupon purged from the defilement of sin, and discharged from all temporal punishments due to him, either here or in purgatory. ‡

* Catech. ibid. n. 75.

† Bellarminus de Satisfact. Bellarm. de Indulg. l. i. c. 7. § Quarta. propositio.

‡ Catech. Rom. ibid. n. 65, 66.

Q. 80. How do these works become thus satisfactory?

A. They are meritorious and satisfactory, § as they are united to the satisfaction of Christ. ||

§ Catech. ibid. n. 72, 73.

|| Bellarm. de forma. satisfact. Bellarm. de Indul. l. 1. c. 4. ss. Respons. non est quidem.

The Sacrament *of* Extreme Unction.

Q. 81. What is the matter of the sacrament of Extreme Unction?

R. 77. To pardon sin, and absolve the sinner judicially, so as the conscience may rest firmly upon it, is a power reserved by God to himself. So 1 John i. 9, 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' And, therefore, the authority of the priest is only ministerial, declarative, and conditional. "Men shew a ministry in the forgiveness of "sins, but do not exercise a right of power. They pray, "but it is God forgives," saith St. Ambrose, de Spir. l. 3. c. 19.

R. 78. The grief which is sufficient to obtain pardon, is contrition; and so the grief which is not sufficient to obtain pardon, must be attrition: and the meaning then is, that attrition with absolution, is as effectual as contrition.

R. 79, 80. The giving satisfaction to the church in case of scandal, and the imposing penances upon notorious offenders, is an useful part of ecclesiastical discipline. But to make that a satisfaction to God which is given to the church; and to make our works to satisfy, though but as an appendant to the satisfaction of Christ, we can by no means allow. Not the former, because it is derogatory to the justice of God; not the latter, because it is derogatory to the merits of our Saviour. For what can make a satisfaction to God, but the obedience and suffering of his Son? Or what need is there of another satisfaction after that of our Saviour? Heb. x. 14, 'By one offering he hath perfected for ever, them that are sanctified.'

Of Extreme Unction.

R. 81, &c. We read, Mark vi. 13, when the twelve apostles were sent forth, they 'anointed with oil many

A. Oil of olive-berries* consecrated by a bishop, which aptly signifies the grace of the Spirit with which the soul of the sick is invisibly anointed.†

* Catech. Rom. par. 2. c. 6. n. 3.
† Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. de Extr. Unct. c. 1.

Q. 82. What is the form of it?

A. The form is, "By this holy anointing, God pardon "thee, by whatever thou hast offended, by the fault of the "eyes, nose, or touch." *Catech. ibid. n.* 6.

Q. 83. What are the parts anointed?

A. The eyes because of seeing, the ears because of hearing, the mouth because of tasting or speech, the hands because of touching, the feet because of motion; the reins because the seat of lust. *Catech. ibid. n.* 10.

Q. 84. When is this anointing administered?

A. It is to be administered only when persons are supposed to be near the point of death,‡ whence it is called Extreme Unction.§

‡ Concil. Trid. ibid. c. 3. Bellarm. Extr. Unct. l. 1. c. 2. et. Accedit.
§ Catech. ibid. n. 2, & 14.

Of the SACRAMENT *of* ORDERS.

Q. 85. Is ordination a sacrament?

A. It is truly and properly a sacrament, and doth confer grace; and whoso denies this is accursed. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 7. *Can.* 1. *and* 23. *cap.* 3. *and Can.* 3.

Q. 86. What are the several orders instituted for the service of the church?

that were sick, and healed them;' making use of that anointing, not as a natural means, but as a mystical sign of the miraculous cure to be wrought by the power of Christ. And as long as this power continued in the church, so long there was a reason for continuing this rite. Accordingly the apostle directs, Jam. v. 14, 15, 'Is any sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick." But when the power ceased, there was no reason for the continuance of this sign. And yet this ceremony of anointing is not only continued in the church of Rome without any pretence to the power, but the nature and the use of it is wholly perverted from what it was in apostolical times. For, 1. This rite was then used in curing the sick, but was not necessary to it; for we find them also cured by imposition of hands, Mark xvi. 18. Acts ix. 17. or by a word, Acts ix. 34. But in the church of Rome it is made absolutely necessary. 2. In apostolical times it was a mere rite, but in the church of Rome it is made a sacrament, and whosoever saith it is a mere rite, is accursed.* 3. It was used in apostolical times properly for corporal maladies; but in the church of Rome properly for the soul, and but accidentally for the body.† 4. It was used then for the recovery of the sick; but here it is to be applied only to those that are judged to be past it.

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. can. 1. † Bellarm. de Extrem. Unct. l. 2. c. 2. § Probo igitur.

Of Orders.

R. 85. We account ordination to be of divine institution, and that by it a ministerial commission is conveyed; but how necessary soever this office is to the church, and grace for the exercise of it, yet as that grace is not promised to it, we cannot admit it to be properly and truly a sacrament.

R. 86. We know of no authority there is for any order under a deacon, so as to anathematize them that do not

A. The orders always received by the catholic church are seven, the greater and less; the greater are the priest, deacon, and subdeacon: the less are the acolythus, who is to carry the candle and assist the subdeacon; the exorcist, who is to attend, and pray over them that are possessed with the devil; the reader, and the ostiarius, or door-keeper. *Catech. par.* 2. *c.* 7. *n.* 12, 15, *&c.*

Of the SACRAMENT *of* MARRIAGE.

Q. 87. Is marriage truly and properly a sacrament?

A. Yes, and whosoever denies it so to be, is accursed. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 24. *Can.* 1.

Q. 88. May those that are in holy orders marry, or those that are married be received into orders in the church of Rome?

A. No, these that are married may not be admitted,* those that are admitted may not marry, and those that being admitted do marry, are to be separated.

* Concil. Later. 1 Can. 21. & Later. 2. Can. 6.

Q. 89. If marriage is a sacrament, and so confers grace, how comes it to be denied to those that are in holy orders? *Catech. Rom. par.* 2. *c.* 8. *n.* 17.

A. Those in holy orders are the temple of God, and it is a shameful thing that they should serve uncleanness. *Later Concil.* 2 *Can.* 6.

receive them.* We know of no authority for the forms used in the ordination of those lower orders; as when the bishop admits any to that of exorcists, he reaches to them a book in which the exorcisms are contained, and saith, "Receive, and commit to memory, and take the power of "laying on of hands upon the possessed, or baptised, or "catechumens." †

* Concil. Trid. ibid. Can. 2. † Catech. ibid. n. 17.

We know of no authority for this kind of procedure; for those forms of conjuration contained in those books, or for the use of those rites therein prescribed, for exorcising persons, houses, cattle, milk, butter, fruits, &c. infested with the devil. See the *Pastorale Mechlin*, and the *Manual of Exorcisms*, *Antwerp*, 1626.

Of Marriage.

R. 87. St. Austin saith, that signs when applied to religious things, are called sacraments.* And in this large sense he calls the sign of the cross a sacrament; † and others give the same name to washing the feet; ‡ and many other mysteries. But then matrimony doth no more confer grace, than washing the feet, or using the sign of the cross; which Bellarmin, after all the virtue he ascribes to it, will not allow to be properly and truly a sacrament.§

* Epist. 5. † In Psal. 141. ‡ Cypr. de lotione pedum.
§ De Imag. l. 2. c. 30. ss. Dicos ergo.

R. 88, 89. The apostle on the contrary, saith, 'Marriage is honourable in all,' Heb. xiii. 4, and gives a hard character of that doctrine which forbids it, 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. And how lawful it was the direction of the apostle about it, 1 Tim. iii. 2, doth shew. And how convenient it is, is manifest from the mischiefs attending the prohibition of it in the Romish church, which wise men among themselves have lamented.||

|| Polyd. Virg. de invent. l. 3. c. 4. & Cassander. Consult. Art. 23.

THE CONCLUSION.

I might have added the 5th section about jurisdiction, which the church of Rome challenges over princes, and about their canonization of saints, their consecration of *Agnus Dei*, and beads, &c. and the use these and the like are applied to. I might have further considered their notes of a church, and shewed how many of them are not true, or however do not belong to the church of Rome: but that would be too large a subject to enter upon: and what has been said will be sufficient to shew how far that church hath erred from truth and reason. For if we set their councils, missals, breviaries, rituals, and catechisms on one side, and Scripture and Antiquity on the other; we shall find their doctrines and practices as truly opposite to those as they are opposite to ours: and may be assured that persons may sooner lose their eyes, than find there such a primacy of St. Peter as they contend for, or their vicarship of the pope, the invocation of saints, the worship of images, service in an unknown tongue, transubstantiation, purgatory; and the rest that we contend against. Scripture and indubitable antiquity are the Authority we appeal to, thither we refer our cause; and can heartily conclude with that of Vincentius Lyrin, *That is to be held, which hath been believed every where, always, and by all.* Contr. Haer. c. 3.

POPERY

CALMLY CONSIDERED.

TO THE READER.

IN the following Tract I propose, First, To lay down and examine the chief Doctrines of the Church of Rome: Secondly, To shew the natural tendency of a few of those Doctrines: and that with all the plainness and all the calmness I can.

SECTION I.—*Of the Church, and the Rule of Faith.*

1. THE Papists judge it necessary to salvation, to be subject to the Pope, as the one visible Head of the Church.

But we read in Scripture that CHRIST is the *Head* of the church, "from whom the whole body is fitly joined together," Col. ii. 19. The Scripture does not mention any visible head of the church: much less does it mention the Pope as such: and least of all does it say, that it is necessary to salvation, to be subject to him.

2. The Papists say, The Pope is Christ's vicar, St. Peter's successor, and has the supreme power on earth over the whole church.

We answer, Christ gave no such power to St. Peter himself. He gave no apostle pre-eminence over the rest. Yea, St. Paul was so far from acknowledging St. Peter's supremacy, that he withstood him to the face, (Gal. ii. 11,) and asserted himself, "not to be behind the chief of the apostles."

Neither is it asserted that St. Peter was the bishop of Rome: no, nor that he ever was there.

But they say, "Is not Rome the mother, and therefore the mistress of all churches?"

We answer, No. The word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem. There the church began. She, therefore, not the church of Rome, is the mother of all churches.

The church of Rome, therefore, has no right to require any person to believe what she teaches on her sole authority.

3. St. Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The Scripture therefore being delivered by men divinely inspired, is a rule sufficient of itself: so it neither needs, nor is capable of any farther addition.

Yet the Papists add Tradition to Scripture, and require it to be received with equal veneration. By traditions they mean, "Such points of faith and practice as have been delivered down in the church from hand to hand without writing." And for many of these they have no more Scripture to shew, than the Pharisees had for their traditions.

4. The church of Rome not only adds tradition to Scripture, but several entire books; namely, Tobit and Judith, the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two Books of Maccabees, Esdras, and a new part of Esther and of Daniel: "Which whole books," says the church of Rome, "whoever rejects, let him be accursed."

We answer, We cannot but reject them. We dare not receive them as part of the Holy Scriptures. For none of these books were received as such by the Jewish church, "to whom were committed the Oracles of God," Rom. iii. 2. Neither by the ancient Christian church, as appears from the sixtieth canon of the council of Laodicea: wherein is a catalogue of the books of Scripture, without any mention of these.

5. As the church of Rome, on the one hand, adds to the

Scriptures, so, on the other, she forbids the people to read them. Yea, they are forbid to read so much as a summary or historical compendium of them in their own tongue.

Nothing can be more inexcusable than this. Even under the law, the people had the Scriptures in a tongue vulgarly known. And they were not only permitted, but required to read them; yea, to be constantly conversant therein, Deut. vi. 6, &c. Agreeably to this, our Lord commands to "Search the Scriptures:" and St. Paul directs, that his "Epistle should be read in all the churches," 1 Thess. v. 27. Certainly this epistle was written in a tongue which all of them understood.

But they say, "If people in general were to read the Bible, it would do them more harm than good." Is it any honour to the bible to speak thus? But supposing some did abuse it, is this any sufficient reason for forbidding others to use it? Surely not. Even in the days of the apostles, there were some *unstable and ignorant men*, who *wrested* both St. Paul's *Epistles*, and *the other Scriptures to their own destruction.* But did any of the apostles, on this account, forbid other Christians to read them? You know they did not: they only cautioned them, "Not to be led away by the error of the wicked." And certainly the way to prevent this is, not to keep the Scriptures from them: (for "they were written for our learning:") but to exhort all to the diligent perusal of them, lest they should "err, not knowing the Scriptures."

6. "But seeing the Scripture may be misunderstood, how are we to judge of the sense of it? How can we know the sense of any scripture, but from the sense of the church?"

We answer, 1. The church of Rome is no more the *church in general*, than the church of England is. It is only one particular branch of the Catholic, or Universal church of Christ, which is the whole body of believers in Christ, scattered over the whole earth. 2. We therefore see no reason, to refer any matter in dispute to the church of Rome, more than any other church; especially as we nei-

ther know the bishop nor the church of Rome, to be any more infallible than ourselves. 3. In all cases, the church is to be judged by the Scripture, not the Scripture by the church. And Scripture is the best expounder of Scripture. The best way therefore to understand it is, carefully to compare scripture with scripture, and thereby learn the true meaning of it.

SECTION II.—*Of Repentance and Obedience.*

1. The church of Rome teaches, "That the deepest repentance or contrition, avails nothing without confession to a priest: but that with this, attrition, or the fear of hell, is sufficient to reconcile us to God."

This is very dangerously wrong, and flatly contrary to Scripture. For Scripture says, "A broken and contrite heart, thou, O God, wilt not despise," Ps. li. 17. And the same texts which make contrition sufficient without confession, shew that attrition even with it, is insufficient. Now as the former doctrine of the insufficiency of contrition without confession, makes that necessary which God has not made necessary; so the latter, of the sufficiency of attrition with confession, makes that unnecessary which God has made necessary.

2. The church of Rome teaches, "That good works truly *merit* eternal life."

This is flatly contrary to what our Saviour teaches: "When ye have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do," Luke xvii. 10. A command to do it, grace to obey that command, *and a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*, must for ever cut off all pretence of *merit* from all human obedience.

3. That a man may truly and properly merit hell, we grant; although he never can merit heaven. But if he

does merit hell, yet, according to the doctrine of the church of Rome, he need never go there. For "the church has power to grant him an *Indulgence*, which remits both the fault and the punishment."

Some of these indulgences extend to so many days, some to so many weeks, but others extend to a man's whole life; and this is called a *Plenary Indulgence*.

These indulgences are to be obtained, by going pilgrimages; by reciting certain prayers: or (which is abundantly the most common way) by paying the stated price of it.

Now can any thing under heaven be imagined more horrid, more execrable than this? Is not this a manifest prostitution of religion to the basest purposes? Can any possible method be contrived, to make sin more cheap and easy? Even the Popish council of Trent acknowledged this abuse, and condemned it in strong terms. But they did not in any degree remove the abuse which they acknowledged. Nay, two of the Popes under whom the council sat, Pope Paul III. and Julius III. proceeded in the same course with their predecessors, or rather exceeded them. For they granted to such *of the fraternity of the holy altar*, as visited the church of St. Hilary of Chartres, during the six weeks of Lent, seven hundred and seventy-five thousand, seven hundred, years of pardon.

4. This miserable doctrine of indulgences is founded upon another bad doctrine, that of *works of supererogation*. For the church of Rome teaches, That there is "an overplus of merit in the saints; and that this is a treasure committed to the church's custody, to be disposed of as she sees meet."

But this doctrine is utterly irreconcileable with the following scriptures: "The sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us," Rom. viii. 18. And "every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," 2 Cor. iv. 17. For if there be no comparison betwixt the reward and the sufferings, then no one has merit to transfer to another. And if every one must give an account of himself to God, then no one can be saved by the merit of another. But

suppose there were a superabundance of merits in the saints, yet we have no need of them, seeing there is such an infinite value in what Christ hath done and suffered for us: seeing he alone hath, "by one offering, perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x. 14.

5. But where do the souls of those go after death, who die in a state of grace; but yet are not sufficiently purged from sin, to enter the kingdom of heaven?

The church of Rome says, "They go to *purgatory*, a purging fire near hell, where they continue till they are purged from all their sins, and so made meet for heaven."

Now, that those who die in a state of grace, go into a place of torment, in order to be purged in the other world, is utterly contrary to Scripture. Our Lord said to the penitent thief upon the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Now if a purgation in another world were necessary for any, he that did not repent and believe till the last hour of his life, might well be supposed to need it: and consequently ought to have been sent to purgatory, not to Paradise.

6. Very nearly akin to that of purgatory is the doctrine of the Limbus Patrum. For the church of Rome teaches, that, "Before the death and resurrection of Christ, the souls of good men departed, were detained in a certain place, called *Limbus Patrum*, which is the uppermost part of hell. The lowermost, they say, is the place of the damned: next above this, is purgatory: next to that *Limbus infantum*, or the place where the souls of infants are."

It might suffice to say, there is not one word of all this in Scripture. But there is much against it. We read that Elijah was taken up into heaven, 2 Kings ii. 11. And he and Moses appeared in glory, Matt. xvii. 2. And Abraham is represented as in Paradise, Luke xvi. 22, the blessed abode of good men in the other world. Therefore none of these were in the *Limbus Patrum*. Consequently, if the bible is true, there is no such place.

SECTION III.—*Of Divine Worship.*

1. The service of the Roman church consists of prayers to God, angels, and saints, of lessons and of confessions of faith.

All their service is every where performed in the Latin tongue, which is no where vulgarly understood. Yea, it is required, and a curse is denounced against all those who say it ought to be performed in the vulgar tongue.

This irrational and unscriptural practice destroys the great end of public worship. The end of this is, the honour of God in the edification of the church. The means to this end is, to have the service so performed as may inform the mind and increase devotion. But this cannot be done by that service which is performed in an unknown tongue.

What St. Paul judged of this, is clear from his own words. "If I know not the meaning of the voice, (of him that speaks in a public assembly,) he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me," 1 Cor. xiv. 11. Again, "If thou shalt bless by the Spirit, (by the gift of an unknown tongue,) how shall the unlearned say, Amen?" ver. 16. How can the people be profited by the lessons, answer at the responses, be devout in their prayers, confess their faith in the creeds, when they do not understand what is read, prayed, and confessed? It is manifest then, that the having any part of divine worship in an unknown tongue, is as flatly contrary to the Word of God, as it is to reason.

2. From the manner of worship in the church of Rome, proceed we to the objects of it. Now the Romanists worship, besides angels, the Virgin Mary, and other saints. They teach, that angels, in particular, are to be "worshipped, invoked, and prayed to." And they have litanies and other prayers composed for that purpose.

In flat opposition to all this, the words of our Saviour are, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." To evade this, they say, "The worship we give to angels is not of the same kind with that which we give to God." Vain words! What kind of worship is pe-

culiar to God, if prayer is not? Surely God alone can receive all our prayers, and give what we pray for. We honour the angels, as they are God's ministers; but we dare not worship or pray to them. It is what they themselves refuse and abhor. So, when "St. John fell down at the feet of the angel to worship him, he said, See thou do it not. I am thy fellow-servant: worship God!" Rev. xix. 10.

3. The Romanists also worship saints. They pray to them as their intercessors. They confess their sins to them: they offer incense and make vows to them. Yea, they venerate their very images and relics.

Now all this is directly contrary to Scripture. And, first, the worshipping them as intercessors. For as "there is but one God to us, though there are gods many, and lords many:" so, according to Scripture, there is but one Intercessor or Mediator to us, (1 Cor. viii. 5.) And suppose the angels or saints intercede for us in heaven, yet may we no more worship them, than because *there are gods many on earth*, we may worship them as we do the true God.

The Romanists allow, "there is only one Mediator of Redemption:" but say, "there are many mediators of intercession." We answer, The Scripture knows no difference between a Mediator of Intercession and of Redemption. He alone *who died and rose again* for us, *makes intercession for us at the right-hand of God.* And he alone has a right to our prayers, nor dare we address them to any other.

4. The worship which the Romanists give to the Virgin Mary, is beyond what they give either to angels or other saints. In one of their public offices, they say, "Command thy son by the right of a mother." They pray to her, to "loose the bands of the guilty, to bring light to the blind, to make them mild and chaste, and to cause their hearts to burn in love to Christ."

Such worship as this cannot be given to any creature, without gross, palpable idolatry. We honour the blessed Virgin, as the mother of the Holy Jesus, and as a person

of eminent piety. But we dare not give worship to her; for it belongs to God alone.

Meantime we cannot but wonder at the application which the church of Rome continually makes to her, of whose acts on earth the Scripture so sparingly speaks. And it says nothing of, (what they so pompously celebrate,) her assumption into heaven, or of her exaltation to a throne above angels or archangels. It says nothing of her being "the mother of Grace and Mercy, the Queen of the gate of heaven," or of her "power to destroy all heresies," and being "all things to all."

5. The Romanists pay a regard to the relics of the saints also, which is a kind of worship. By relics they mean the bodies of the saints, or any remains of them, or particular things belonging or relating to them when they were alive; as an arm or thigh, bones or ashes; or the place where, or the things by which they suffered. They venerate these, in order to obtain the help of the saints. And they believe "by these, many benefits are conferred on mankind: that by these relics of the saints, the sick have been cured, the dead raised, and devils cast out."

We read of good king Hezekiah, that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made," 2 Kings xviii. 4. And the reason was, because the children of Israel burnt incense to it. By looking up to this, the people bitten by the fiery serpents had been healed. And it was preserved from generation to generation, as a memorial of that divine operation. Yet when it was abused to idolatry, he ordered it to be broken in pieces. And were these true relics of the saints, and did they truly work these miracles, yet that would be no sufficient cause for the worship that is given them. Rather this worship would be a good reason, according to Hezekiah's practice, for giving them a decent interment.

6. Let us next consider, what reverence the church of Rome requires to be given to images and pictures. She requires "to kiss them; to uncover the head; to fall down before them, and use all such postures of worship as they

would to the persons represented if present." And accordingly "the priest is to direct the people to them, that they may be worshipped." They say, indeed, that "in falling down before the image, they worship the saint or angel whom it represents." We answer, 1. We are absolutely forbidden in Scripture, to worship saints or angels themselves: Secondly, We are expressly forbidden "to fall down and worship any image, or likeness, of any thing in heaven or earth," whomsoever it may represent. This, therefore, is flat idolatry, directly contrary to the commandment of God.

7. Such likewise, without all possibility of evasion, is the worship they pay to the cross. They pray, that God may make the wood of the cross, to "be the stability of faith, an increase of good works, the redemption of souls."

They use all expressions of outward adoration, as kissing and falling down before it. They pray directly to it, to "increase grace in the ungodly, and blot out the sins of the guilty." Yea, they give *Latria* to it. And this they themselves say, "is the sovereign worship that is due only to God."

But, indeed, they have no authority from Scripture, for their distinction between *Latria* and *Dulia;* the former of which they say, is due to God alone, the latter that which is due to saints. But here they have forgotten their own distinction. For although they own *Latria* is due only to God, yet they do in fact give it to the cross. This then, by their own account, is flat idolatry.

8. And so it is to represent the blessed Trinity by pictures and images, and to worship them. Yet these are made in every Romish country, and recommended to the people to be worshipped: although there is nothing more expressly forbidden in Scripture, than to make any image or representation of God. God himself never appeared in any bodily shape. The representation of "the Ancient of Days," mentioned in Daniel, was a mere prophetical figure, and did no more literally belong to God, than the eyes or ears that are ascribed to him in Scripture.

SECTION IV.—*Of the Sacraments.*

1. THE church of Rome says, "A sacrament is a sensible thing instituted by God himself, as a sign and a means of grace."

"The sacraments are seven, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and marriage."

"The parts of a sacrament are, the matter, and the form or words of consecration. So in baptism, the matter is water; the form, 'I baptize thee,' &c."

On this we remark, Peter Lombard lived about 1110 years after Christ. And he was the first that ever determined the sacraments to be seven. St. Austin (a greater than he) positively affirms, "that there are but two of Divine institution."

Again, To say, That a sacrament consists of matter and form, and yet either has no form, as confirmation and extreme unction, (neither of which is ever pretended to have any form of words, instituted by God himself,) or has neither matter nor form, as penance, or marriage, is to make them sacraments and no sacraments. For they do not answer that definition of a sacrament which themselves have given.

2. However, they teach, that "all these seven confer grace *ex opere operato*, by the work itself, on all such as do not put an obstruction." Nay, it is not enough, that we do not put an obstruction. In order to our receiving grace, there is also required previous instruction, true repentance, and a degree of faith. And even then, the grace does not spring merely *ex opere operato:* it does not proceed from the mere elements, or the words spoken: but from the blessing of God, in consequence of his promise to such as are qualified for it.

Equally erroneous is that doctrine of the church of Rome, that "in order to the validity of any sacrament, it is absolutely necessary the person who administers it, should do it with a holy intention." For it follows, that wherever there

is not this intention, the sacrament is null and void. And so there is no certainty, whether the priest, so called, be a real priest? For who knows the intention of him that ordained him? And if he be not, all his ministrations are of course null and void. But if he be, can I be sure that *his* intention was holy, in administering the baptism or the Lord's supper? And if it was not, they are no sacraments at all, and all our attendance on them is lost labour.

3. So much for the sacraments in general, let us now proceed to particulars.

"*Baptism*, say the Romanists, may, in case of necessity, be administered by women, yea, by Jews, infidels, or heretics." No: our Lord gave this commission only to the apostles, and their successors in the ministry.

The ceremonies which the Romanists use in baptism are these:

Before *baptism*, 1. *Chrism*, that is, oil mixed with water is to be consecrated. 2. *Exorcism*, that is, the priest is to blow in the face of the child, saying, "Go out of him, Satan!" 3. He *crosses* the forehead, eyes, breast, and several other parts of the body. 4. He puts *exorcised salt* into his mouth, saying, "Take the salt of wisdom." 5. He puts spittle into the palm of his left hand, puts the forefinger of his right hand into it, and anoints the child's nose and ears therewith, who is then brought to the water.

After baptism, first, he anoints the top of the child's head with chrism, as a token of salvation: secondly, he puts on him a white garment, in token of his innocence: and, thirdly, he puts a lighted candle into his hand, in token of the light of faith.

Now what can any man of understanding say, in defence of these idle ceremonies, utterly unknown in the primitive church, as well as unsupported by Scripture? Do they add dignity to the ordinance of God? Do they not rather make it contemptible?

4. The matter of confirmation is the chrism, which is an ointment consecrated by the bishop. The form is, the words he uses in crossing the forehead with the chrism,

namely, "I sign thee with the sign of a cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

Then the person confirmed, setting his right foot on the right foot of his godfather, is to have his head bound with a clean headband: which, after some days, is to be taken off and reserved till the next Ash-Wednesday, to be then burnt to holy ashes.

The Roman Catechism says, "Sacraments cannot be instituted by any beside God." But it must be allowed, Christ did not institute confirmation, therefore it is no sacrament at all.

5. We come now to one of the grand doctrines of the church of Rome, that which regards the Lord's supper. This therefore we would wish to consider with the deepest attention. They say, "In the Lord's supper, whole Christ is really, truly, and substantially contained; God-man, body and blood, bones and nerves, under the appearance of bread and wine."

They attempt to prove it thus: "Our Lord himself says, *This is my body*. Therefore, upon consecration, there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread, into the whole substance of Christ's body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood: and this is usually termed *Transubstantiation*.

"Yet we must not suppose, that Christ is broken, when the host (or consecrated bread) is broken; because there is whole and entire Christ, under the species of every particle of bread, and under the species of every drop of wine."

We answer, No such change of the bread into the body of Christ, can be inferred from his words, "This is my body." For it is not said, "This is changed into my body;" but, "This is my body:" which, if it were to be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. But that they are not to be taken literally is manifest from the words of St. Paul, who calls it bread, not only before, but likewise after the consecration, 1 Cor. x. 17. chap. xi. ver. 26, 27, 28. Here we see, that what was

called his body, was bread at the same time. And accordingly these elements are called by the fathers, the images, the symbols, the figure of Christ's body and blood.

Scripture and antiquity then are flatly against transubstantiation. And so are our very senses. Now our Lord himself appealed to the senses of his disciples, Luke xxiv. 39, "Handle and see me; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Take away the testimony of our senses, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit. But if we believe transubstantiation we take away the testimony of all our senses.

And we give up our reason too. For if every particle of the host is as much the whole body of Christ, as the whole host is before it is divided, then a whole may be divided, not into parts, but into wholes. For, divide and subdivide it over and over; and it is whole still! It is whole before the division; whole in the division; whole after the division! Such nonsense, absurdity, and self-contradiction, all over, is the doctrine of transubstantiation!

6. An evil practice attending this evil doctrine is, The *depriving the laity of the cup* in the Lord's supper. It is acknowledged by all, that our Lord instituted and delivered this sacrament *in both kinds:* giving the wine as well as the bread, to all that partook of it: and that it continued to be so delivered in the church of Rome for above a thousand years. And yet, notwithstanding this, the church of Rome now forbids the people to *drink of the cup!* A more insolent and barefaced corruption cannot easily be conceived.

Another evil practice in the church of Rome, utterly unheard of in the ancient church, is, that when there is none to receive the Lord's supper, the priest *communicates alone.* (Indeed it is not properly to *communicate*, when only one receives it.) This likewise is an absolute innovation in the church of God.

But the greatest abuse of all in the Lord's supper is, the *worshipping the consecrated bread.* And this the church of Rome not only practises, but positively enjoins. These are her words: "The same sovereign worship which is due

to God, is due to the host. Adore it. Pray to it. And whosoever holds it unlawful so to do, let him be accursed."

The Romanists themselves grant, that if Christ is not corporally present in the Lord's supper, this is idolatry. And that he is not corporally present any where but in heaven, we learn from Acts ii. 11. ch. iii. 21. "Thither he went, and there he will continue, till the time of the restitution of all things."

7. Consider we now what the Romanists hold, concerning the sacrament of penance.

"The matter of the sacrament of penance is, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; the form, I absolve thee."

We object to this: You say, "The matter of a sacrament is something sensible," perceivable by our senses. But if so, penance is not a sacrament. For surely, contrition is not something perceivable by the outward senses!

Again; they say, "Confession is a particular discovery of all mortal sins to a priest, with all their circumstances, as far as they can be called to mind, without which there can be no forgiveness or salvation."

We answer, Although it is often of use, to confess our sins to a spiritual guide, yet to make confessing to a priest necessary to forgiveness and salvation, is, "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." And to make it necessary in all cases, is to lay a dangerous snare both for the confessor and the confessed.

They go on, "The sentence pronounced by the priest in absolution, is pronounced, by the judge himself. All the sins of the sinner are thereby pardoned, and an entrance opened into heaven."

We cannot allow it. We believe the absolution pronounced by the priest, is only declarative and conditional. For judicially to pardon sin and absolve the sinner, is a power God has reserved to himself.

Once more: You say, "Satisfaction is a compensation made to God by alms, &c. for all offences committed against him."

We answer, 1. It cannot be, that we should satisfy God,

by any of our works. For, 2. Nothing can make satisfaction to him, but the obedience and death of his Son.

8. We proceed to what they call, "The sacrament of *extreme unction*." "The matter," they say, "of extreme unction is, oil consecrated by the bishop, and applied to the eyes, ears, mouth, hands, feet, and reins, of a person supposed to be near death." The form is, "By this holy anointing, God pardon thee for whatever thou hast offended by the eyes, ears, mouth, or touch."

We reply: When the apostles were sent forth, "they anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them," (Mark vi. 13,) using this as a sign of the miraculous cures to be wrought. And St. James accordingly directs, "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church, let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick," (ch. v. ver. 14, 15.) But what has this to do with the extreme unction of the church of Rome? In the first church this anointing was a mere rite: in the church of Rome it is made a sacrament: it was used in the first church for the body: it is used in the church of Rome for the soul. It was used then for the recovery of the sick; now, for those only that are thought past recovery. It is easy, therefore, to see, that the Romish extreme unction has no foundation in Scripture.

9. We are now to consider, what the church of Rome delivers concerning *Ordination*. "This," says she, "is properly a sacrament. He that denies it, let him be accursed."

"The orders received in the church of Rome, are seven: the priest, the deacon, the sub-deacon, the acolythus to carry the candle, the exorcist to cast out devils, the reader, and the door-keeper."

On this we observe, it is not worth disputing, whether ordination should be called a sacrament or not. Let the word then pass; but we object to the thing; there is no divine authority for any order under a deacon. Much less is there any scriptural authority, for the forms of conjura-

ration prescribed to the exorcists, or for the rites prescribed in exorcising not only men, women, and children, but likewise houses, cattle, milk, butter, or fruits, said to be infested with the devil.

10. The next of their sacraments, so called, is marriage: concerning which they pronounce, "Marriage is truly and properly a sacrament. He that denies it so to be, let him be accursed."

We answer, in one sense it may be so. For St. Austin says, "Signs, when applied to religious things, are called sacraments." In this large sense he calls the sign of the cross a sacrament: and others give the name to washing the feet. But it is not a sacrament according to the Romish definition of the word: for it no more "confers grace," than washing the feet, or signing with the cross.

A more dangerous error in the Church of Rome is, the *forbidding the clergy to marry*. "Those that are married may not be admitted into orders: those that are admitted may not marry: and those that being admitted, do marry, are to be separated."

The apostle on the contrary, says, "Marriage is honourable in all," Heb. xiii. 4, and accuses those who *forbid to marry*, of "teaching doctrines of devils." How lawful it was for the clergy to marry, his directions concerning it shew, 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. And how convenient, yea, necessary in many cases it is, clearly appears from the innumerable mischiefs, which have, in all ages, followed the prohibition of it in the Church of Rome: which so many wise and good men, even of her own communion, have lamented.

I have now fairly stated, and calmly considered most of the particular doctrines of the Church of Rome. Permit me to add a few considerations of a more general nature.

That many members of that church have been holy men, and that many are so now, I firmly believe. But I do not know, that any of them who are dead, were more holy than many Protestants, who are now with God: yea, than some of our own country, who were very lately removed to

Abraham's bosom. To instance only in one, (whom I mention the rather, because an account of his life is extant,) I do not believe, that many of them of the same age, were more holy than THOMAS WALSH. And I doubt, if any among them living now, are more holy than several Protestants now alive.

But be this as it may. However, by the tender mercies of God, many members of the Church of Rome, have been and are now holy men, notwithstanding their principles, yet I fear many of their principles have a natural tendency to undermine holiness; greatly to hinder, if not utterly to destroy, the essential branches of it; to destroy the love of God, and the love of our neighbour, with all justice, and mercy, and truth.

I wish it were possible to lay all prejudice aside, and to consider this calmly and impartially. I begin with the love of God, the fountain of all that holiness, without which we cannot see the Lord. And what is it that has a more natural tendency to destroy this than idolatry? Consequently, every doctrine which leads to idolatry naturally tends to destroy it. But so does a very considerable part of the avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome. Her doctrine, touching the worship of angels, of saints, the Virgin Mary in particular, touching the worship of images, of relics, of the cross, and above all the host, or consecrated wafer, leads all who receive it to practise idolatry, flat, palpable idolatry, the paying that worship to the creature, which is due to God alone.—Therefore, it has a natural tendency to hinder, if not utterly destroy the love of God.

Secondly, the doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to hinder, if not destroy, the love of our neighbour. By the love of our neighbour, I mean universal benevolence, tender good-will to all men. For in this respect, every child of man, every son of Adam, is our neighbour; as we may easily learn from our Lord's history of the good Samaritan. Now the Church of Rome by asserting, that all who are not of her own church, that is, the bulkof mankind, are in a state of utter rejection from God, despis-

ed and hated by him that made them; and by her bitter (I might say, accursed) anathemas, devoting to absolute, everlasting destruction, all who willingly or unwillingly differ from her, in any jot or tittle; teaches all her members to look upon them with the same eyes as she supposes God to do: to regard them as mere fire-brands of hell, *vessels of wrath fitted for destruction.* And what love can you entertain for such? No other than you can believe God to have for them. Therefore, every anathema denounced by the Church of Rome, against all who differ from her, has a natural tendency, not only to hinder, but utterly destroy the *love of our neighbour.*

Thirdly, the same doctrine which devotes to utter destruction so vast a majority of mankind, must greatly indispose us for shewing them the *Justice* which is due to all men. For how hard is it to be just to them we hate! To render them their due, either in thought, word, or action! Indeed, we violate justice by this very thing, by not loving them as ourselves. For we do not render unto all their due; seeing love is due to all mankind. If we owe *no man any thing beside,* do we not owe this, *to love one another?* And where love is totally wanting, what other justice can be expected? Will not a whole train of injurious tempers and passions, of wrong words and actions naturally follow? So plain, so undeniably plain it is, that this doctrine of the Church of Rome, (to instance at present in no more,) That "all but those of their own church are accursed," has a natural tendency to hinder, yea, utterly to destroy *justice.*

Fourthly, Its natural tendency to destroy *Mercy,* is equally glaring and undeniable. We need not use any reasoning to prove this: only cast your eyes upon matter of fact? What terrible proofs of it do we see, in the execrable crusades against the Albigenses! In those horrible wars in the Holy Land, where so many rivers of blood were poured out! In the many millions that have been butchered in Europe, since the beginning of the Reformation: not only in the open field, but in prisons, on the scaffold, on the gibbet, at the stake! For how many thousands

of lives, barbarously taken away, has Philip II. to give an account to God? For how many thousands, that infamous, perfidious butcher, Charles IX. of France? To say nothing of our own bloody Queen Mary, not much inferior to them. See in Europe, in America, in the uttermost parts of Asia, the dungeons, the racks, the various tortures of the Inquisition, so unhappily styled *the House of Mercy!* Yea, such mercy as is in the fiends of hell! Such mercy as the natives of Ireland in the last century, shewed to myriads of their Protestant countrymen! Such is the mercy which the doctrine of the Church of Rome very naturally inspires!

Lastly, the doctrine of the Church of Rome has a natural tendency to destroy *Truth* from off the earth. What can more directly tend to this, what can more incite her own members to all lying and falsehood, than that precious doctrine of the Church of Rome, That "no faith is to be kept with heretics?" Can I believe one word that a man says, who espouses this principle? I know it has been frequently affirmed, that the Church of Rome has renounced this doctrine. But I ask, When or where? By what public and authentic act, notified to all the world? This principle has been publickly and openly avowed by a whole council, the ever-renowned council of Constance: (an assembly never to be paralleled, either among Turks or Pagans, for regard to justice, mercy, and truth!) But when and where was it as publickly disavowed? Till this be done in the face of the sun, this doctrine must stand before all mankind, as an avowed principle of the Church of Rome.

And will this operate only toward heretics? Toward the supposed enemies of the Church? Nay, where men have once learned not to keep faith with heretics, they will not long keep it towards Catholics. When they have once overleaped the bounds of truth, and habituated themselves to lying and dissimulation, toward one kind of men, will they not easily learn, to behave in the same manner toward all men? So that instead of *putting away all lying*, they will put away all truth! And instead of having *no*

guile found in their mouth, there will be found nothing else therein?

Thus naturally do the principles of the Romanists tend to banish truth from among themselves. And have they not an equal tendency to cause lying and dissimulation among those that are not of their communion; by that Romish principle, that force is to be used in matters of religion? That if men are not of our sentiments, of our church, we should thus *compel them to come in?* Must not this, in the very nature of things, induce all those over whom they have any power, to dissemble, if not deny those opinions, who vary ever so little from what that church has determined? And if a habit of lying and dissimulation is once formed, it will not confine itself to matters of religion. It will assuredly spread into common life, and tincture the whole conversation.

Again, Some of the most eminent Roman casuists (whose books are duly licensed by the heads of the Church) lay it down as an undoubted maxim, That although malicious lies are sins, yet "*officious* lies, that is, lies told in order to do good, are not only innocent, but meritorious." Now what a flood-gate does this open for falsehood of every kind! Therefore, this doctrine likewise has a natural tendency to banish truth from the earth.

One doctrine more of the Romish Church, must not here be passed over, I mean that of *Absolution* by a priest, as it has a clear, direct tendency to destroy both justice, mercy, and truth, yea, to drive all virtue out of the world. For if a man (and not always a very good man) has power to forgive sins: if he can, at pleasure, forgive any violation, either of truth, or mercy, or justice: what an irresistible temptation must this be to men of weak or corrupt minds! Will they be scrupulous with regard to any pleasing sin, when they can be absolved upon easy terms? And if after this, any scruple remain, is not a remedy for this provided? Are there not *Papal Indulgences* to be had? Yea, *Plenary Indulgences?* I have seen one of these which was purchased at Rome, not many years ago. This

single doctrine of Papal indulgences strikes at the root of all religion. And were the church of Rome ever so faultless in all other respects, yet till this power of forgiving sins, whether by *Priestly Absolution*, or *Papal Indulgences*, is openly and absolutely disclaimed: and till these practices are totally abolished, there can be no security in that church, for any morality, any religion, any justice, or mercy, or truth.

THE

ADVANTAGES

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

OVER THOSE

Of the Church of Rome.

I LAY this down as an undoubted truth, "The more "the Doctrine of any church agrees with the Scripture, "the more readily ought it to be received." And on the other hand, "The more the Doctrine of any church differs "from the Scripture, the greater cause we have to doubt "of it."

2. Now it is a known principle of the Church of England, that nothing is to be received as an article of faith, which is not read in the holy Scripture, or to be inferred therefrom, by just and plain consequences. Hence it follows, that every Christian has a right to know and read the Scripture, that he may be sure what he hears from his teachers agrees with the revealed Word of God.

3. On the contrary, at the very beginning of the Reformation, the Church of Rome began to oppose this principle, that all articles of faith must be proveable from Scripture, (till then received throughout the whole Christian world,) and to add, if not prefer, to holy Scripture, tradition, or the doctrine of fathers and councils, with the

decrees of popes. And soon after she determined in the council of Trent, "That the Old and New Testament, and "the traditions of the church, ought to be received *pari* "*pietatis affectu ac reverentia*, (with equal piety and reve-"rence);" and that "it suffices for laymen, if they be-"lieve and practise what the church believes and requires, "whether they understand the ground of that doctrine and "practice or not."

4. How plain is it, that this remedy was found out, because they themselves observed, that many doctrines, practices, and ceremonies of their church, not only could not be proved by Scripture, but were flatly contradictory thereto?

As to the fathers and councils we cannot but observe, that in a hundred instances they contradict one another: consequently, they can no more be a rule of faith to us, than the papal decrees, which are not grounded on Scripture.

5. But the Church of Rome does not stop here. She not only makes tradition of equal authority with the Scripture, but also takes away the Scripture from the people, and denies them the use of it.

For soon after her writers began to teach, yea and assert in entire volumes,

"That the Scripture is obscure, and hard to be under-"stood;

"That it gives a handle to error and heresies;

"That it is not a perfect or sufficient rule of life;

"That it ought to be understood no otherwise than the "*church*, (that is, the Pope) explains it;

"That consequently the reading the Scripture is of more "hurt than use to the generality of Christians."

And, in fact, they not only publickly spoke against the reading the holy Scriptures, but in most countries absolutely forbad the laity to read them, yea and the clergy too, till they were ordered to preach. And if any did read them without a particular licence, they condemned and punished it as a great crime.

6. Thus the case stands to this day: yea, the late controversies in France, make it undeniably plain, that the Church of Rome does now labour more earnestly than ever, to take away the use of the Scriptures, even from those who have hitherto enjoyed them.

Seeing, therefore, the Church of England contends *for* the word of God, and the Church of Rome *against* it, it is easy to discern on which side the advantage lies, with regard to the grand principle of Christianity.

7. But that it may more clearly appear, how widely the church of Rome differs from the holy Scriptures, we have set down a few instances, wherein they flatly contradict the written Word of God.

Thus the church of Rome, after acknowledging that the Apostle terms *concupiscence* sin; yet scruples not to add immediately, "The Catholic church never understood, "that this is truly and properly sin: and if any think the "contrary, let him be accursed." *Conc. Trid. Sess.* 5.

Thus, although Christ himself says to all his disciples, *Without me ye can do nothing*; yet the church of Rome condemns this very proposition, as false and heretical, "The grace of Jesus Christ, the effectual principle of all "good, is necessary to every good word. Not only nothing "good is done without it, but nothing can be done." In the bull *Unigenitus*.

8. In like manner, the Church of Rome does not scruple to impose upon the consciences of men, in the doctrine of the mass, various traditions, that have no authority from holy writ: and also takes away the cup in the Lord's supper from the laity, contrary to the plain institution of Christ, as well as to the acknowledged custom of the primitive church. Whence it manifestly appears, that it is not the design of the Roman Church to conform itself to the rule of the written Word.

9. Again, the Church of Rome pronounces all those accursed, (*Con. Trid. Sess.* 7,) who say,

"That baptism, confirmation, the Lord's supper, pe-
"nance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, are not
"sacraments instituted by Christ himself: or,

"That there are more or fewer sacraments than *seven;*
"or,

"That any of these is not truly and properly a sacra-
"ment: or,

"That they do not confer grace barely by the work
"done."

Now whereas these positions cannot be proved by Scripture, and yet are enjoined to be believed under pain of an *Anathema*, it is hence also plain, that the Church of Rome does purposely teach, and also maintain by open force, things which partly are not founded on holy Writ, partly are contrary thereto.

10. As to the sacraments in particular, it is easy to shew, that they require in each of them such doctrines and customs to be received, as are wholly unsupported by, if not also contrary to, the word of God.

For example. They teach, that

In baptism, "The right intention of the minister is so
"indispensably necessary, that if it be wanting, the bap-
"tized receives no benefit: (*ibid.*) that

"Confirmation was a true and proper sacrament from the
"beginning: (*ibid.*) that

"In the Lord's supper the bread and wine are converted
"into the natural body and blood of Christ: (*Sess.* 13,
"*and* 22.)

"That every particle of what is consecrated is no longer
"bread, but the entire body of Christ:

"That it ought to be worshipped and adored: and

"That the laity ought not to receive the cup."

In penance, "That a full confession of all our sins to
"the priest is absolutely necessary, or they cannot be par-
"doned: (*Sess.* 14.)

"That the penances imposed, (such as pilgrimages,

" whipping themselves, and the like,) do meritoriously co-
" operate toward the forgiveness of sins:

" That this forgiveness is obtained, not through the
" merits of Christ alone, but also through the merits and
" intercession of the Virgin Mary and other Saints: that

" Extreme unction is a true and proper sacrament insti-
" tuted by Christ: *(ibid.)*

" That the oil, blessed by the bishop, eases the soul of
" the sick, and preserves him from the temptations of the
" devil: that

" Ordination is a true and proper sacrament, instituted
" by Christ: *(Sess. 23.)*

" That an indelible character is given thereby:

" That there were from the beginning those seven orders
" in the church, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, acolythists,
" exorcists, readers, and door-keepers:

" That the proper business of a priest is, to consecrate
" and offer the body and blood of Christ, and to remit or
" retain sins in the chair of confession: that

" Marriage is a true and proper sacrament, instituted by
" Christ:

" That nevertheless marriage may be dissolved by either
" party's entering into a convent, even against the consent
" of the other:

" That it is unlawful for any of the clergy to marry."

11. Now seeing all these doctrines are unsupported by, if not also contrary to, the Word of God, which yet the Church of Rome requires to be received as true, and pronounces all accursed who do not receive them, we cannot but conclude, that the Church of England enjoys an unspeakable advantage over the Church of Rome, with respect to her doctrines, which are wholly agreeable to, and founded on, the written word of God.

12. The advantage of the Church of England, over the Church of Rome, is equally great with regard to public worship.

For it is manifest, that the public worship of the Roman

Church is wholly degenerated from the nature of Christ's kingdom and the simplicity of the first Christians:

That at present it consists in magnificent buildings, altars, images, ornaments, and habits; in splendid ceremonies; in processions, and pilgrimages, and prayers in an unknown tongue; and in reciting the Creed, the Lord's prayer, and the Ave Maria, over and over according to the number of their beads;

That they are not instructed to worship God in spirit and in truth as their loving and most beloved Father; and to praise him, and comfort one another, with psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs;

That their souls are not edified by sermons and catechising out of the word of God, the Scripture being cited very sparingly in their sermons, and generally in a strained and allegorical sense;

That they are not permitted to search the Scriptures at home, and seek food for their souls therein;

That the common people are by this means purposely kept in the grossest ignorance and superstition.

13. It is manifest also, that they are held in doubt as to the salvation both of the living and the dead, by the doctrine of purgatory.

That hereby the minds of those who want to be assured of the state of their souls, are disquieted and disturbed:

That pardon of sins, release from punishment due thereto, and redemption from purgatory by masses and indulgences, either for the living or dead, are daily sold for money.

14. It is no less manifest, that their trust in Christ alone, the one Mediator between God and man, is hindered so much the more, the more the people are referred to the merits and intercession of the blessed Virgin, and other Saints:

The more they are taught to adore their images and relics; to make vows to them, and to implore their help in any trouble:

Yea, and to place therein a very considerable part of their worship and devotion;

As well as in a bare outward observance of saints-days, and other festivals of the church, and in the abstaining from some particular kinds of meat, on what they call fast-days.

15. All these practices wholly unsupported by Scripture, the Church of Rome retains to this day; at the same time that she rejects and pronounces accursed all, whether practices or doctrines, that make against her, be they ever so plainly contained in, and grounded on the word of God.

Our reformers seeing this, judged it needful to inquire whether it could be proved by holy writ,

That the bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter;

That he is Christ's vicar upon earth, and the visible head of the church:

That he has a right of interpreting the Word of God according to his own pleasure;

To introduce and prohibit doctrines, besides and against the written Word;

To license things which the Scriptures forbid

To exercise a spiritual, and, in many cases, a secular power, over all Christians, kings and emperors not excepted:

To anathematize all that oppose his will, depose princes, and absolve subjects from their allegiance:

To denounce heretics; to curse, kill, torture, and burn alive, all who do not submit to him in every point.

16. Some of the reasons they had to doubt of these things, were those which follow:

That neither St. Peter, nor any of the ancient bishops, had the same doctrine or manner of governing the church, which the bishop of Rome now has, as is clear both from the epistles of St. Peter, from the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the ancient ecclesiastical history:

That Christ alone *is made of God, Head over all things*

C[illegible] [illegible] 15. Col. i. 18. Who is *with* k[illegible] [illegible] *the world:*

[illegible] Christ, being not of this world, [illegible] the hierarchy and monarchy of the [illegible]

[illegible] the see of Rome no more proves the [illegible] of St. Peter, than the possessing [illegible] proves the *Great Turk*, to be the [illegible] the Great.

[illegible] were the vicar of Christ, (which is not [illegible] would have no authority to change or [illegible] of his Lord and King; much less to [illegible] contrary to them, or to exempt any from [illegible] of Christ:

[illegible] of this kind denote an adversary, rather [illegible] and upright vicar of Christ.

[illegible] of these things the more, because the [illegible] knew of no such thing as an universal [illegible]

[illegible] no opinion was acknowledged as such, at the time [illegible] of Nice:

[illegible] Gregory the Great declared, "He should ac- [illegible] any man to be antichrist, who called himself by [illegible]:

[illegible] apparent that Boniface III. the next pope [illegible] about the year 606, was the first to whom [illegible] universal Bishop was given, as a reward for [illegible] the vilest Phocas, after he had murdered his [illegible] the emperor Mauritius, with his empress, and eight [illegible]

[illegible] the succeeding popes acquired one part of their [illegible] another, by various methods, either of fraud [illegible]

[illegible] many of them have been notoriously wicked [illegible] of all manner of wickedness: not- [illegible] which men are required to believe that [illegible] by the Holy Ghost, in so extraor-

dinary a manner, as to be rendered infallible; although one pope was continually contradicting another, and reversing the decrees which his predecessors had most solemnly established.

18. When the Romanists are desired to prove by Scripture, that the pope is the head of the church, they urge, that Christ said to St. Peter, 1. *I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* 2. *Feed my lambs; feed my sheep.*—Therefore—

We answer, These texts by no means prove that Christ made St. Peter himself his vicar; much less that he gave that dominion to the pope, which he now usurps over the consciences of men.

And hence we are the more clearly convinced,

That the papal power is not of divine original;

And that we have great cause to bless God, whom the pope has excluded from his communion, and thereby restored to that unshaken liberty of conscience, wherein, by the grace of God, we shall always stand.

9. In the proper use of this liberty every member of our church, if he gives himself up to the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, may learn the foundation of his faith from the written word of God;

May read and meditate therein day and night;

May devoutly pray in the spirit of adoption, like the holy men of ancient times;

May comfort and quicken himself and others with psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs;

May enjoy all the ordinances of Christ, according to his own institution;

May be assured of the remission of his sins, and of his justification through faith in Christ, the Spirit of God witnessing with his spirit, that he is a child of God;

May study to have a conscience void of offence, both toward God and toward man;

May freely enjoy every blessing which God hath bestowed upon our church; and

May make advantage of whatever good the providence of God has still preserved in the Church of Rome:

He may cheerfully look for a happy death, and a blessed eternity:

And, at length, by resting on Christ alone, and patiently partaking of his sufferings, he may, with certain hope of a resurrection to eternal life, without any fear either of purgatory or hell, resign his spirit into the hand of God, and so be ever with the Lord.

A SHORT METHOD

OF CONVERTING ALL THE ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

Humbly proposed to the Bishops and Clergy of that Kingdom.

I. IT is a melancholy consideration to those who love the Protestant interest, that so small a part of this nation is yet reformed from Popery. They cannot observe, without a very sensible concern, that in many parts of the kingdom, there are still ten, nay, fifteen, perhaps, upwards of twenty Papists, to one Protestant. Nor can they see any prospect of its being otherwise; few Papists being brought over to our church, notwithstanding all the methods which have been used, while many Protestants are seduced from it.

II. Yet they cannot but earnestly desire, that all the Papists were convinced of their errors. How much would this redound to the glory of God, who willeth all to come to the knowledge of his truth! How greatly would it advantage their own souls both in this world and in the world to come! What an advantage would it be to the kingdom in general to be no longer divided against itself, to have that grand cause of contention removed, and all its inhabitants of one heart and one mind! And how highly would it advance both the honour and interest of our gracious Sovereign, to have all his subjects cordially united together, thinking and speaking the same thing?

III. Why then is not this desirable end pursued with a vigour proportionable to its importance? Is it because we despair of any success? Because we think it impossible to

be attained? But why should we imagine it to be impossible? A common and plausible answer is, because the Papists are so bigotted to their clergy; believing all that they affirm, however contrary both to Scripture and Reason, and doing all that they direct, whom they generally believe to be the holiest and wisest of men.

IV. Undoubtedly this is a considerable difficulty in the way. And yet I cannot think it is insurmountable. Still I conceive it is possible to convince all the Papists, provided there are proper instruments for the work. And what instruments are so proper as the clergy? Not only as they are in every place, distributed through the whole nation, and always ready on the spot for the work: but likewise as it more immediately belongs to them: as it is no inconsiderable branch of their business who are peculiarly set apart to *watch over* the *souls* of men *as they that must give account.*

V. But what way can the clergy take, with any probability of success? There is one way, and one only; one that will (not probably, but) infallibly succeed. If this way is taken, I am willing to stake my life upon the success of it. And it is a plain, simple way, such as may be taken by any man, though but of a small capacity. For it requires no peculiar depth of understanding, no extraordinary height of learning; but only a share of common sense, and an honest, upright heart.

VI. It was observed, that the grand difficulty of the work lies, in the strong attachment of the Papists to their clergy. Here therefore we are to strike at the root. And if this bigotry be but removed, whatever error or superstition is built upon it, will of course fall to the ground.

Now this may be effectually done thus. The Papists themselves allow that one set of clergy were holier and wiser even than their own, namely, the apostles. They allow these both to have lived and preached better than the present clergy even of the Roman church.

Here therefore is the short and sure method. Let all the clergy of the church of Ireland only *live* like the apostles, and *preach* like the apostles, and the thing is done.

The Romans, on the same ground that they prefer the apostles before their own clergy, will then prefer ours before them. And when they once do this, when we have carried this point, when their attachment to our clergy is stronger than that to their own; they will be convinced by hundreds, till there is not a Roman left in the kingdom of Ireland.

VII. If it be asked, But how did the apostles live and preach? I answer, (not to descend to particulars,) as to their inward life, (if I may so speak,) they *lived the life which is hid with Christ in God.* "They were crucified with Christ. Nevertheless they lived: yet not they, but Christ lived in them." So that each of them could say, "The life which I now live in the flesh," even in this mortal body, "I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved ME, and gave himself for ME."

And this faith continually wrought by love, that *love of God* which was *shed abroad in their hearts*, and was a perennial *fountain of water, springing up into everlasting life.*

By this loving faith their hearts were purified from anger, from pride, from all vile affections, from the love of money, of power, of pleasure, of ease, from the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life: all their "affections being set on things above, not on things of the earth." In a word, that *mind* was *in them which was in Christ Jesus.*

Let but this mind be in every clergyman of our church, and Popery will vanish out of the kingdom.

VIII. As to the outward life of the apostles, it was in general, holy and unblamable in all things. Herein did they exercise themselves day and night, with regard to every word and action, "to have a conscience void of offence, toward God and man." And their continual ground of "rejoicing was this, the testimony of their conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity they had their conversation in the world."

They were temperate in all things. They denied themselves, and took up their cross daily. They "kept under their bodies and brought them into subjection," even in the

midst of distresses and persecutions; "lest by any means, after they had preached to others, they themselves should become cast-aways."

They were in every respect burning and shining lights; they went about doing good as they had opportunity, doing good of every kind, and in every possible degree, to all men. They abstained from all appearance of evil. They overcame evil with good. If their enemy hungered, they fed him, if he thirsted, they gave him drink; and, by patiently continuing so to do, "heaped coals of fire upon his head," and melted his hardness into love.

In fine, it was their meat and drink, to do the will of their Father which was in heaven. And hence whatsoever they did, whether in word or deed, they did all to the glory of God.

Let every clergyman of our church *live* thus, and, in a short time, there will not be a Papist in the nation.

IX. As to the preaching of the apostles, with regard to the matter of it, they preached Jesus, "the Author and Finisher of our faith, having determined not to know any thing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." They preached Jesus Christ as "of God made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." They declared, "Other foundation" of morality, religion, holiness, happiness, "can no man lay." All they spoke either in public or private, centred in this one point, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

More particularly, they preached, that "a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law;" that "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

X. They preached farther, that "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God:" except he be "born from above," born not only of water, but "of the Holy Ghost:" and that the present "kingdom of God is not meats and drinks," (lies not in externals of any kind,) *but righteousness*, the image of God on the heart, *peace*, even a peace that passeth all understanding, *and joy in the*

Holy Ghost, whereby they rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

They declared, that he that is thus "born of God doth not commit sin;" that "he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and the wicked one toucheth him not;" but that as Christ who hath called him is holy, so is he holy in all manner of conversation.

XI. As to the manner of their preaching, they spoke with authority, as speaking not their own word, but the word of him that sent them, and "by manifestation of the truth, commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." They were "not as many that corrupt the word of God," debase and adulterate it with foreign mixtures, "but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, spake they in Christ." They approved themselves the ministers of God, "in much patience, in labours, in watchings, in fastings: by pureness, by knowledge," knowing all their flock by name, all their circumstances, all their wants: "by long-suffering, never weary of well-doing, by kindness, by love unfeigned; by the word of truth, by the power of God attending it, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand, and on the left." Hence they were "instant in season, out of season," being never afraid of the faces of men, never ashamed of Christ or of his words, even before an adulterous and sinful generation. They went on unmoved through "honour and dishonour," through "evil report and good report." They regarded not father or mother, or wife or children, or houses or lands, or ease or pleasure: but having this single end in view, to save their own souls, and those that heard them, they "counted not their lives dear unto themselves, so that they might make full proof of their ministry, so they might finish their course with joy, and testify the gospel of the grace of God."

Let all the right reverend, the bishops, and the reverend the clergy, only walk by this rule: let them thus live, and thus testify with one heart and one voice, the gospel of the grace of God; and every Papist within these four seas, will soon acknowledge the truth as it is in Jesus.

A

LETTER

TO THE PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER,

OCCASIONED

BY THE LATE ACT PASSED IN FAVOUR OF POPERY.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A DEFENCE OF IT, IN TWO LETTERS

TO THE EDITORS OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL, DUBLIN.

A Letter to the Printer of the Public Advertiser.

SIR,

SOME time ago, a Pamphlet was sent me, intitled, "*An Appeal from the Protestant Association, to the People* "*of Great Britain.*" A day or two since, a kind of Answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces "its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious." On the contrary, I think the style of it is clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning (in general) strong and conclusive; the object, or design, kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of the same kind and benevolent design, namely, to preserve our happy constitution, I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that Tract, by a few plain arguments.

With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as "boundless a freedom in religion," as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point: I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the Word of

God. I consider not, whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore away with all your common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion. Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible: yet, I insist upon it, That no Government not Roman catholic, ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

I prove this by a plain argument: (let him answer it that can.)—That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus. It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that "No faith is to be kept with heretics." This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the Members of that Church, can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore, they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mahometan, or Pagan.

You may say, "Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance." True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, "No faith is to be kept with heretics," sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still, no governors that are not Roman Catholics, can have any security for their allegiance.

Again. Those who acknowledge the *spiritual power* of the Pope, can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this: therefore, they can give no security for their allegiance.

The power of granting *pardons* for all sins, past, present, and to come, is and has been for many centuries one branch of his *spiritual power*.

But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power, can give no security for their allegiance: since they

believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever.

The power of *dispensing* with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the *spiritual power* of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power, must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the *dispensing power* of the Pope, can give no security of his allegiance to any government.

Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air, a dispensation makes them all null and void.

Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest has *power to pardon sins!*—This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason.

Setting then religion aside, it is plain, that upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men, who cannot give any security to that government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds, that "No faith is to be kept with Heretics," but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution, or the *spiritual power* of the Pope.

"But the late Act," you say, "does not either *tolerate* or *encourage* Roman Catholics." I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already, (let alone what it *may* do by and by,) *encourage* them to preach openly, to build chapels, (at Bath and elsewhere,) to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily.

But "nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them." I am not certain of that. Some time since, a Romish Priest came to one I knew; and after talking with her largely, broke out, "You are no Heretic! You have the experience of a real Christian!" "And

would you," she asked, "burn me alive?" He said, "God forbid!—Unless it were for the good of the Church!!"

Now what security could she have had for her life, if it had depended on that man? *The good of the Church* would have burst all ties of truth, justice, and mercy. Especially when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or (if need were) a papal pardon.

If any one please to answer this, and to set his name, I shall probably reply.—But the productions of anonymous writers, I do not promise to take any notice of.

I am, Sir, your humble servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

City-Road, Jan. 21, 1780.

TO THE READER.

SEVERAL months since, Father O'Leary, a Capuchin-Friar, in Dublin, published Remarks upon this Letter in the Freeman's Journal. As soon as these were sent to me, I published a Reply in the same Paper. When I read more of his Remarks, printed in five succeeding Journals, I wrote a second Reply, but did not think it worth while to follow, step by step, so wild, rambling a Writer.

Mr. O'Leary has now put his Six Letters into One, which are reprinted in London, with this title, "Mr. O'Leary's Remarks on the Rev. Mr. W.'s Letters in defence of the Protestant Associations in England: to which are prefixed Mr. Wesley's Letters."

Is it by negligence or by design, that there are so many mistakes even in a title-page?

1. "To which are prefixed Mr. W.'s Letters." No: the second of those Letters is not mine. I never saw it before.

2. But where are the two Letters published in the Freeman's Journal? Why is a *spurious* Letter palmed upon us, and the genuine ones suppressed?

3. "Letters in defence of the Protestant Associations in England." Hold! In my first Letter I have only *three lines* in defence of a Tract published in London. But I have not one line "in defence of the Associations," either in London or elsewhere.

If Mr. O'Leary will seriously answer the two following Letters, he may expect a serious Reply. But if he has only drollery and low wit to oppose to argument, I shall concern myself no further about him.

London, Dec. 29, 1780.

LETTER I.

To the Editors of the Freeman's Journal.

GENTLEMEN,

1. Mr. O'Leary does well to entitle his Paper *Remarks;* as that word may mean any thing or nothing; but it is no more an answer to my Letter, than to the *Bull Unigenitus.* He likewise does wisely in prefacing his Remarks with so handsome a compliment: this may naturally incline you to think well of his judgment, which is no small point gained.

2. His manner of writing is easy and pleasant, but might it not as well be more serious? The subject we are treating of is not a light one; it moves me to tears rather than to laughter. I plead for the safety of my country; yea, for the children that are yet unborn. "But cannot your country be safe, unless the Roman Catholics are persecuted for their religion?" Hold! Religion is out of the question: but I would not have them persecuted at all. I would only have them hindered from doing hurt: I would not put it in their power, (and I do not wish that others should,) to cut the throats of their quiet neighbours. "But they will give security for their peaceable behaviour." They cannot while they continue Roman Catholics: they cannot while they are members of that church which receives the decrees of the Council of Constance, which maintains the *spiritual power* of the *Bishop of Rome,* or the doctrine of *priestly absolution.*

3. This I observed in my late Letter; whoever therefore would *remark* upon it to any purpose, must prove these three things: 1. That the decree of the Council of Constance *publickly* made, has been *publickly* disclaimed. 2. That the Pope has not power *to pardon sins*, or to dispense with oaths, vows, and promises: and, 3. That no priest has power to pardon sins. But has Mr. O'Leary proved these three points? Has he proved any one of them? He has indeed said something upon the first. He denies such a decree was ever made.

4. I am persuaded Mr. O'Leary is the first man that ever made the important discovery. But before he is quite sure, let him look again into Father L'Abbe's *Concilia Maxima*, printed at Paris in the year 1672. The last volume contains a particular account of the Council of Constance: one of whose decrees, page 169, is, "That Heretics ought to be put to death, *Non obstantibus salvis conductibus Imperatoris, Regum*, &c." notwithstanding the public faith engaged to them in the most solemn manner. Who then can affirm that no such doctrine or violation of faith with Heretics is authorised by this Council? Without putting on spectacles, (which, blessed be God, I do not wear,) I can read a little Latin still. And while I can, I must fix this horrid doctrine on the Council of Constance.

5. But supposing the Council of Constance had never advanced this doctrine, or the Church of Rome had publickly disclaimed it; my conclusion stands good, till it is proved, 1. That no Priest has a power of pardoning sins: and, 2. That the Pope has neither a power of pardoning sins, or of dispensing with oaths, vows, promises, &c.

Mr. O'Leary has proved neither of these, and what has he proved? It is hard to say. But if he proves nothing, he either (directly or indirectly) asserts many things. In particular, he asserts, 1. Mr. Wesley has arraigned in the jargon of the Schools: Heigh-day! What has this to do here? There is no more of the jargon of the Schools in my letter, than there is of Arabic: "The Catholics all

over the world are liars, perjurers, &c." Nay, I have not arraigned one of them. This is a capital mistake. I arraign the doctrines, not the men. Either defend *them*, or renounce *them*.

"I do renounce them," says Mr. O'Leary. Perhaps you do. But the Church of Rome has never renounced them. "He asperses our communion in a cruel manner." I do not asperse it at all, in saying, these are the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Who can prove the contrary?

2. "Mr. O'Leary did not even attempt to seduce the English soldiery." I believe it; but does this prove any of *these three* points? "But Queen Elizabeth and King James roasted Heretics in Smithfield?" In what year? I doubt the fact.

3. "Mr. Wesley is become an apologist of those who burned the chapel in Edinburgh." Is not this said purely *ad movendam invidiam?* To inflame the minds of the people? For it has no shadow of truth. I never yet wrote, nor spoke one word in their defence. "He urged the rabble to light that fire." No more than he urged them to dethrone the King.

4. "Does Mr. Wesley intend to sound Alecto's horn, or the war-shell of the Mexicans." All this is cruel aspersion indeed; designed merely to inflame! What I intend, is neither more nor less than this, to contribute my mite to preserve our Constitution both in Church and State.

5. "They were the Scotch and English regicides who gave rise to the Irish massacre!" The Irish massacre!!! Was there ever any such thing? Was not the whole account *a mere Protestant lie?* O no! It was a melancholy truth, written in the blood of many thousands. But the regicides no more gave rise to that massacre than the Hottentots. The whole matter was planned several years, and executed before the King's death was thought of. "But Mr. Wesley is sowing the seeds of another massacre!" Such another as the massacre of Paris!

6. "Was he the trumpeter of persecution, when he was persecuted himself?" Just as much as now. Cruel asper-

sions still! Designed and calculated only to inflame. "Did he then abet persecution on the score of conscience?" No, nor now. Conscience is out of the question. "His Letter contains all the horrors, invented by blind misguided zeal, set forth in the most bitter language." Is this gentleman in his senses? I hope not. Else I know not what excuse to make for him. Not one *bitter* word is in my letter. I have learned to put away *all bitterness, with all malice.* But still this is wide of the mark; which of *those three points does it prove?*

7. "In his *second* Letter he promises to put out the fire which he has already kindled in England?" Second letter? What is that? I know nothing of it, "The fire which he has kindled in England."—When?—Where? I have kindled no fire in England any more than in Jamaica. I have done, and will do, all that is in my power, to put out that which others have kindled.

8. "He strikes out a creed of his own for Roman Catholics. This fictitious creed he forces upon them." My words are these: "Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true." I say not a word more of the matter. Now, I appeal to every *reasonable* man, "Is this striking "out a creed of my own for Roman Catholics? Is this "forcing a fictitious creed on them, like the Frenchman "and the Blunderer in the Comedy?" What have I to do with one or the other? Is not this *dull* jest quite out of season? And is the creed, composed by the Council of Trent, and the Bull of Pope Pius IV. a *fictitious one?* Before Mr. O'L. asserts this again, let him look into the *Concilia Maxima* once more, and read there, "*Bulla Pii Quarti super forma Juramenti professionis fidei.*" This *forma professionis fidei*, I call Pope Pius's creed. If his "*stomach revolts from it,*" who can help it?

9. Whether the account given by Philip Melancthon of the words spoken (not in Hebrew but in Latin) be true or false, it does not at all affect the account of Miss Duchesne, which I gave in her own words. And I cannot but observe, that after all the witticisms which he has bestowed upon it,

Mr. O'Leary does not deny that the *Priest might have burnt her*, "*had it been for the good of the Church.*"

10. "*Remark* a Missionary inflaming the rabble, and propagating black slander."—*Remark* a SAN BENITO Cap, *painted with devils; but let him put it on, whom it fits.* It does not fit *me:* I inflame no rabble: I propagate no slander at all. But Mr. O'Leary does. He propagates a heap of slander in these his Remarks. I say too, "Let the Appeal be made to the *Public and their impartial reason.*" I have nothing to do with the "*jargon or rubbish of Schools,*" lugged in like the jargon of Schools before. But I would be glad if Mr. O'Leary would tell us what these two *pretty* phrases mean?

The whole matter is this. I have, without the least bitterness, advanced three reasons, why I conceive it is not safe to tolerate the Roman Catholics. But still I would not have them persecuted: I wish them to enjoy the same liberty, civil, and religious, which they enjoyed in England, before the late Act was repealed. Mean time, I would not have a sword put into their hands; I would not give them liberty to hurt others. Mr. O'Leary with much *archness and pleasantry has nibbled at one of these* three reasons, leaving the other two untouched. If he chooses to attack them in his next, I will endeavour to give him a calm and serious answer.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

Manchester, March 23, 1780.

LETTER II.

To the Editors of the Freeman's Journal.

GENTLEMEN,

SOME time ago, in a letter published at London, I observed, "Roman Catholics cannot give those whom they account Heretics, any sufficient security for their peaceable behaviour:"

1. Because it has been publickly avowed in one of their General Councils, and never publickly disclaimed, That faith is not to be kept with Heretics:

2. Because they hold the doctrine of priestly absolution: and,

3. The doctrine of papal pardons and dispensations.

Mr. O'Leary has published *Remarks* on this letter: nine parts in ten of which are quite wide of the mark, not that they are wide of *his* mark, which is to introduce a plausible panegyric upon the Roman Catholics, mixed with keen invectives against the Protestants, whether true or false it matters not. All this is admirably well calculated, to inspire the reader with aversion to these Heretics, and to bring them back to the holy, harmless, much-injured Church of Rome! And I should not wonder, if these six papers should make six thousand converts to her.

Close arguing he does not attempt, but he vapours, and skips to and fro, and rambles to all points of the compass, in a very lively and entertaining manner.

Whatever has the face of an argument in his first letter, I answered before. Those of the 14th, 16th, 18th, and 21st instant, I pass over at present: I have now only to do with what he advances in your Journal of March 12.

Here I read, "For Mr. Wesley's second Letter, see the last page." I have seen it; but I can find no more in the second Letter in the last page, than in the first. It would be strange if I did; for that second Letter was never heard of, but in Mr. O'Leary's Remarks. "But why then does he mention it over and over?" Truly I cannot tell.

He begins, "Fanaticism"—Hold! There is no fanaticism in my Letter, but plain, sober reason. I "now expect" (they are his own words) "a serious answer to a serious charge."

My argument was, The Council of Constance has openly avowed violation of faith with Heretics. But it has never been openly disclaimed. Therefore those who receive this Council, cannot be trusted by those whom they account

Heretics.—This is my immediate conclusion. And if the premises be admitted, it will infallibly follow.

On this, Mr. O'Leary says, "A Council so often quoted, challenges peculiar attention. We shall examine it with all possible precision and impartiality. At a time when the broachers of a new doctrine" (as new as the Bible) "were kindling the fire of sedition, and shaking the foundations of thrones and kingdoms"—Big words, but entirely void of truth;—"was held the Council of Constance. To this, was cited John Huss, famous for propagating errors tending to—wrest the sceptre from the hands of kings."—Equally true. "He was obnoxious to Church and State." To the Church of Rome: not to the State in any degree.

"Protestant and Catholic Legislators enacted laws for burning Heretics." How wisely are these jumbled together! And the Protestants placed first! But pray what Protestant Legislator made such laws, either before or after the Catholic ones?—I know one man, Servetus, was burnt at Geneva; but I know not that there was any law for it. And I know one woman, Joan Bocher, was burnt in Smithfield, much against the mind of king Edward. But what is this to the numbers who were inhumanly butchered by queen Mary? To say nothing of her savage husband. "But the same laws were executed by queen Elizabeth and king James." How! Did either of these burn Heretics? Queen Elizabeth put *two* Anabaptists to death! But what was this to the achievements of her sister?

He adds a well-devised apology for the Romish persecutions of the Protestants, as necessarily resulting from the nature of things, and not from any wrong principles. And this he illustrates by the treatment formerly given to the Methodists, whose Love-feasts and Watch-nights rouzed the vigilance of the magistrate, and influenced the rage of the rabble." Indeed they did not. Not only no magistrate ever objected either to one or the other, but no mob, even in the most turbulent times, ever interrupted them.

†

But to the Council. "*Huss* strikes at the root of all temporal power and civil authority. He boldly asserts, That all princes, magistrates, &c. in the state of mortal sin, are deprived, *ipso facto*, of all power and jurisdiction. And, by broaching these doctrines, he makes Bohemia a theatre of intestine war. See the Acts of the Council of Constance in L'Abbe's Collection of Councils."

I have seen them, and I can find nothing of all this therein. But more of this by and by.

"He gave notice that he would stand his trial. But he attempted to escape." No, never: this is pure invention. "He is arrested at Constance," whence he never attempted to escape—" and confined. His friends plead his safe-conduct. The Council then declared, *No safe-conduct granted by the Emperor or any other Princes, to Heretics, ought to hinder them from being punished as Justice shall require. And the person who has promised them security, shall not be obliged to keep his promise, by whatever tie he may be engaged.*"

And did the Council of Constance declare this? Yes, says, Mr. O'Leary. I desire no more. But before I argue upon the point, permit me to give a little fuller account of the whole affair.

The Council of Constance was called by the Emperor Sigismund, and Pope John the 23d, in the year 1414. Before it began, the Emperor sent some Bohemian gentlemen, to conduct John Huss to Constance, solemnly promising, That he should "come and return freely, without fraud or interruption."

But before he left Prague, he waited on the bishop of Nazareth, Papal Inquisitor for that city and diocese, who, in the presence of many witnesses gave him the following testimonial:—

"We, Nicholas,—do by these presents, make known to all men, That we have often talked with that honourable man, Master John Huss, and in all his sayings, doings, and behaviour, have proved him to be a faithful man; find-

ing no manner of evil, sinister, or erroneous doings in him, unto this present." Prague, August 30, 1414.

This was attested by the hand and seal of the public notary, named Michael Pruthatietz.

After this, Conrade, Archbishop of Prague, declared before all the Barons of Bohemia, That "he knew not that John Huss was culpable or faulty, in any crime or offence whatever."

So neither the Inquisitor nor the Archbishop knew any thing of "his making Bohemia a theatre of intestine war!" In October he began his journey, accompanied with two noblemen, Wencelat de Duba, and John de Clum. On Nov. 3d, he came to Constance, and was treated with great respect. But not long after, he was suddenly arrested and cast into a noisome prison. Here he quickly fell sick. During his sickness, his accusers exhibited twelve articles against him. But none of them charge him with sedition. They relate purely to the Church.

May 14, 1415, the Nobles of Bohemia complained to the Council, "When Master John Huss came to the Council, under the Emperor's safe-conduct, he was, in violation of the public faith, imprisoned before he was heard." They add, "And he is now grievously tormented, both with fetters, and with hunger and thirst."

June 8, his accusers brought thirty-nine articles more, and afterward twenty-six others. But both the former and the latter relate wholly to the Church.

Seven more were brought next. The first of these is, "If the Pope, Bishop, or Prelate, be in deadly sin, he is then no Pope, Bishop, or Prelate." But this he himself explains in the same tract whence it is taken. "Such, as touching their deserts, are not worthily Popes or Pastors before God: yet as touching their office, are Popes and Pastors."

After these, six more articles were exhibited, but all relate to the Church, as do nineteen more that followed them. In fine, nineteen others were preferred by the Chancellor

and University of Paris. One of these was, "No man being in deadly sin, is a true Pope, Prelate, or Lord." This seems to be the same with the preceding charge; only they have mended it by adding the word *Lord*. Another was, "Subjects ought publickly to reprove the vices of their rulers." It does not appear, that ever he held this.

In the seventeenth session, the sentence and condemnation of John Huss was read and published. The emperor then commanded the duke of Bavaria to deliver him to the executioners; for which glorious exploit he was thus addressed by the bishop of Landy, in the name of the council: "This most holy and godly labour was reserved only for Thee, O most noble Prince! Upon thee only doth it lie, to whom the whole rule and ministration of justice is given. Wherefore thou hast established thy praise and renown; even by the mouths of babes and sucklings thy praise shall be celebrated for evermore."

From this whole transaction we may observe, 1. That John Huss was guilty of no crime, either in word or action; even his enemies, the archbishop of Prague, and the Papal inquisitor, being judges.

2. That he never preached or wrote any thing tending to sedition: neither was there in fact any sedition, much less intestine war in Bohemia, while he ministered there.

3. That his real fault, and his only one was, opposing the Papal usurpations.

4. That this "most noble Prince" was a bigotted, cruel, perfidious murderer, and that the fathers of the council deserve the same praise, seeing they urged him to imbrue his hands in innocent blood, in violation of the public faith, and extolled him to the skies for so doing. And, seeing they have laid it down as a maxim, That the most solemn promise, made to a heretic, may be broken.

But says Mr. O'L. "This regards the peculiar case of safe-conducts granted by princes to heretics." If you mean, they took occasion from a particular case, to establish a general rule; this is true. But what then? If the public faith with heretics may be violated in one instance, it may

be in a thousand. "But can the rule be extended farther?" It may; it must; we cannot tell where to stop. Away then with your witticisms on so awful a subject. What, do you sport with human blood? I take burning men alive to be a very serious thing. I pray, spare your jests on the occasion.

But you have another plea. "Sigismund only promised to guard him from any violence in *going to* the council." Why this was just nothing. What man in his wits would have moved a step upon such a promise as this? "But this was all it was in his power to do." It was not. It was in his power to have told the council, "My own honour, and yours, and that of the empire, are at stake. I will not upon any account suffer the public faith to be violated: I will not make myself infamous to all generations. My name shall not stink to all future ages. I will rather part with my empire, with my life." He could have taken John Huss out of their hands, and have sent him safe to his own country. He would have done it, had he been an honest man; had he had either honour or conscience. I ask Mr. O'L. Would not *you* have done it, had you been in Sigismund's place? If you say, "No," a Protestant ought not to trust you, any more than he would trust a wild bull.

I am afraid, this is the case; for you strangely add, "It was nugatory in Sigismund, to grant him a safe-conduct. For neither king nor emperor could deprive the bishops of their right of judging," (add, and murdering heretics.) It is plain, Sigismund thought he could, that he could screen Huss from all dangers; else he had been both a fool and a knave to promise it: especially by a public instrument which pledged his own honour and that of the whole empire for his safety.

Now for flourish. "Thus the superannuated charge of *violation of faith with heretics*"—No more superannuated now than it was while John Huss was in the flames—— "vanishes away."—No, nor ever will. It still stares us in the face, and will do so, till another general council publickly and explicitly repeals that infamous determination of the

Council of Constance, and declares the burning of John Huss to have been an open violation of all justice, mercy, and truth. But flourish on! "The foundation then of Mr. W.'s aerial fabric being sapped,"—not at all,—"the superstructure falls of course, and his long train of false and unchristian assertions."—What can this mean? I know of no *long train of assertions*, whether true or false! I use three arguments and no more, in proof of one conclusion.

"What more absurd, than to insist on a general council's disclaiming a doctrine which they never taught?" They *did* teach it: and that not by the by, not incidentally; but they laid it down as a stated rule of action, dictated by the Holy Ghost. I quote chapter and verse. I say too, "See L'Abbe's Councils," printed at Paris, in 1672. Yea, and they were not ashamed to publish this determination to all the Christian world! And to demonstrate their sincerity therein, by burning a man alive. And this Mr. O'L. humourously compares, to the roasting a piece of beef! With equal tenderness I suppose he would compare, the "making the beards of heretics," (that is, thrusting a burning furze-bush in their face) to the singing a fowl before it was roasted.

"It is sufficient to disclaim it, when it is fixed upon us." Then disclaim it without delay; for it is fixed upon you, to all intents and purposes. Nay, and you fix it upon yourselves, in every new edition of the councils; in all of which this council stands in *æternam rei memoriam*, and this very determination, without the least touch of blame! It must therefore stand as an avowed doctrine of the Church of Rome that "Heretics ought to be condemned and executed, notwithstanding the most solemn assurances to the contrary:" in other words, that, "*The public faith, even that of kings and emperors, ought not to be kept with heretics.*"

What security then for my life can any man give me, till he utterly renounces the Council of Constance? What security can any Romanist give a Protestant, till this doctrine is publickly abjured? If Mr. O'Leary has any thing more

more to plead for this Council, I shall follow him step by step. But let him keep his word, and "give a serious answer to a serious charge." "Drollery may come in, when we are talking of roasting fowls;" but not when we talk of "roasting men."

Would I then wish the Roman Catholics to be persecuted? I never said or hinted any such thing. I abhor the thought: it is foreign to all I have preached and written for these fifty years. But I would wish the Romanists in England, (I had no others in view,) to be treated still with the same lenity that they have been these sixty years: to be allowed both civil and religious liberty, but not permitted to undermine ours. I wish them to stand just as they did, before the late Act was passed: not to be persecuted or hurt themselves; but gently restrained from hurting their neighbours.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

Chester, March 31, 1780.

A DISAVOWAL OF PERSECUTING PAPISTS.

I have read a tract lately sent me, and will now give my free thoughts upon the subject.

I set out early in life with an utter abhorrence of persecution in every form, and a full conviction that every man has a right to worship God according to his own conscience. Accordingly, more than fifty years ago, I preached on those words, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of: for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." And I preached on the same text, in London, the fifth of last November. And this I extend to members of the Church of Rome, as well as to all other men.

I agree not only that many of these in former ages were good men, (as Thomas à Kempis, Francis Sales, and the Marquis de Renty,) but that many of them are so at this

day. I believe I know some Roman Catholics, who sincerely love both God and their neighbour, and who steadily endeavour to do unto every one, as they wish him to do unto them.

But I cannot say, this is a general case: nay, I am fully convinced, it is not. The generality of Roman Catholics wherever I have been, are of the same principles, and the same spirit with their forefathers. And indeed, if they held the same principles, it could not be doubted, but they would be of the same practice too, if opportunity should serve.

Those principles, openly avowed by their forefathers, of priestly absolution, Papal indulgences, and No faith to be kept with heretics, have never been openly and authoritatively disavowed, even unto this day. And until they are, a Roman Catholic, consistent with his principles, cannot be trusted by a Protestant.

For the same principles naturally tend to produce the same spirit, and the same practice. Very lately, a person seeing many flocking to a place, which she did not know was a Romish chapel, innocently said, What do all these people want? And was answered by one of them, with great vehemence, "We want *your blood.* And we will have it soon."

On Friday last I dined with a gentlewoman, whose father, living in Dublin, was very intimate with a Roman Catholic gentleman. Having invited him to dinner one day, in the course of conversation, Mrs. Gr—— asked him, "Sir, would you really cut my husband's throat, if your priest commanded you?" He answered honestly, "Madam, Mr. Gr—— is my friend. And I love him well: but I must obey the Church." "Sir," said she, "I beg I may never more see you within my doors."

But still, be their principles what they will, I would not persecute them. So persecution is utterly out of the question. I know no one that pleads for it. Therefore the writing or talking against it, is time lost: it is proving what no one denies.

And the Romanists never have been persecuted in England since I remember. They have enjoyed a full toleration. I wish them to enjoy the same toleration still; neither more nor less.

I would not hurt a hair of their head. Mean time I would not put it into their power to hurt me, or any other persons whom they believe to be hereties. I steer the middle way. I would neither kill, nor be killed. I would not use the sword against them; nor put it into their hands, lest they should use it against *me*: I wish them well: but I dare not trust them.

But still I say, Persecution is out of the question. And I look on all vague declamations upon it, which have been lately poured out, as either mere flourishes of persons who think they talk prettily, or artful endeavours to puzzle the cause, and to throw dust into the eyes of honest Englishmen.

Bristol, March 18, 1782.

THE

ORIGIN OF IMAGE-WORSHIP

AMONG

CHRISTIANS.

WHEN Christianity was first preached in the world, it was supported by such miraculous assistance of the divine power, that there was need of little or no human aid to the propagation of it. Not only the apostles, who first preached it, but even the lay-believers were sufficiently instructed in all the articles of faith, and were inspired with the power of working miracles, and the gift of speaking in languages unknown to them before.

But when the gospel was spread, and had taken root through the world; when kings and princes became Christians, and when temples were built and magnificently adorned for Christian worship; then the zeal of some well-disposed Christians brought pictures into the churches, not only as ornaments, but as instructers of the ignorant; and from thence they were called *libri laicorum*, the books of the people. Thus the walls of the churches were beset with pictures, representing all the particular transactions mentioned. And they, who did not understand a letter of a book, knew how to give a very good account of the gospel, being taught to understand the particular passages of it in the pictures of the church. Thus, as Hieroglyphics were the first means of propagating knowledge, before writing by letters and words was invented; so the more

ignorant people were taught compendiously by pictures, what, by the scarcity of teachers, they had not an opportunity of being otherwise fully instructed in.

But these things, which were at first intended for good, became, by the devil's subtlety, a snare for the souls of Christians. For when Christian princes, and the rich and great, vied with one another who should embellish the temples with greatest magnificence, the pictures upon the walls were turned into gaudy images upon the altars; and the people being deceived by the outward appearance of the priest's bowing and kneeling (before those images) as the different parts of their devotion led them, they imagined that those gestures were designed to do honour to the images, before which they were performed, (which they certainly were not;) and so from admiring, the people came to adore them. Thus, what were at first designed as monuments of edification, became the instruments of superstition. This being a fatal oversight in the clergy, at first neglected, or winked at, by degrees, (as all errors have crept into the church,) gathered strength; so that, from being in the beginning, the dotage of the ignorant vulgar, the poison infected those of better rank, and by their influence and countenance, brought some of the priests over to their opinion, or rather those priests were the occasion of deceiving the rich and powerful, especially the female sex, for ends not very reputable or agreeable to the integrity of their profession. But so it was, that what the priests at first winked at, they afterwards gave countenance to; and what they once countenanced, they thought themselves obliged in honour to defend; till at last, superstition came to be preached from the pulpits, and gross idolatry obtruded upon the people for true devotion.

It is true, there were many of the sacred order, whose sound hearts and clear heads, were very averse to this innovation; who both preached and wrote against the worship of images, shewing both the wickedness and folly of it. But the disease was so far spread, and the poison had taken such root, that the consequence of opposition was the divid-

ing the church into parties and schisms, and at last proceeded to blood and slaughter.

N. B. Is it not marvellous that what was so simple in the beginning, should degenerate into such idolatry as is scarcely to be found in the heathen world! While this, and several other errors, equally contrary to Scripture and reason, are found in the church, together with the abominable lives of multitudes who call themselves Christians; the very name of Christianity must stink in the nostrils of the Mahometans, Jews, and Infidels.

REASONS

AGAINST

A SEPARATION

FROM

The Church of England.

WHETHER it be *lawful* or not, (which itself may be disputed, being not so clear a point as some may imagine,) it is by no means *expedient* for us to separate from the Established Church:

1. Because it would be a contradiction to the solemn and repeated declarations which we have made in all manner of ways, in preaching, in print, and in private conversation:

2. Because, (on this as well as on many other accounts,) it would give huge occasion of offence to those who seek and desire occasion, to all the enemies of God and his truth:

3. Because it would exceedingly prejudice against us many who fear, yea, who love God, and thereby hinder their receiving so much, perhaps any further, benefit from our preaching:

4. Because it would hinder multitudes of those who neither love nor fear God, from hearing us at all:

5. Because it would occasion many hundreds, if not some thousands of those who are now united with us, to separate from us; yea, and some of those who have a deep work of grace in their souls:

6. Because it would be throwing balls of wild-fire among them that are now quiet in the land. We are now sweetly united together in love. We mostly think and speak the same thing. But this would occasion inconceivable strife and contention, between those who left, and those who remained in the Church, as well as between those who left us, and those who remained with us: nay, and between those very persons who remained, as they were variously inclined one way or the other:

7. Because, whereas controversy is now asleep, and we in a great measure live peaceably with all men, so that we are strangely at leisure to spend our whole time and strength in enforcing plain, practical, vital religion, (O what would many of our forefathers have given, to have enjoyed so blessed a calm!) This would utterly banish peace from among us, and that without hope of its return. It would engage me for one, in a thousand controversies, both in public and private; (for I should be in conscience obliged to give the reasons of my conduct, and to defend those reasons against all opposers,) and so take me off from those more useful labours, which might otherwise employ the short remainder of my life:

8. Because to form the plan of a new church would require infinite time and care, (which might be far more profitably bestowed,) with much more wisdom and greater depth and extensiveness of thought, than any of us are masters of:

9. Because from some having barely entertained a distant thought of this, evil fruits have already followed, such as prejudice against the clergy in general; and aptness to believe ill of them; contempt (not without a degree of bitterness) of clergymen as such, and a sharpness of language toward the whole order, utterly unbecoming either gentlemen or Christians:

10. Because the experiment has been so frequently tried already, and the success never answered the expectation. God has, since the Reformation, raised up from time to time many witnesses of pure religion. If these lived and

died (like John Arndt, Robert Bolton, and many others,) in the churches to which they belonged, notwithstanding the wickedness which overflowed both the teachers and people therein; they spread the leaven of true religion far and wide, and were more and more useful, till they went to Paradise. But if upon any provocation or consideration whatever, they separated, and founded distinct parties, their influence was more and more confined; they grew less and less useful to others, and generally lost the spirit of religion themselves in the spirit of controversy:

11. Because we have melancholy instances of this, even now before our eyes. Many have in our memory left the Church, and formed themselves into distinct bodies. And certainly some of them from a real persuasion, that they should do God more service. But have any separated themselves and prospered? Have they been either more holy, or more useful than they were before?

12. Because by such a separation we should not only throw away the peculiar glorying, which God has given us, that we do and will suffer all things for our brethren's sake, though the more we love them, the less we be loved: but should act in direct contradiction to that very end, for which we believe God hath raised us up. The chief design of his providence in sending us out, is undoubtedly to quicken our brethren. And the first message of all our preachers is, to the lost sheep of the Church of England. Now would it not be a flat contradiction to this design, to separate from the Church? These things being considered, we cannot apprehend, (whether it be lawful in itself or not,) that it is lawful for us: were it only on this ground, that it is by no means expedient.

II. It has indeed been objected, that till we do separate, we cannot be a compact, united body.

It is true, we cannot till then be *a compact, united body*, if you mean by that expression, a body distinct from all others. And we have no desire so to be.

It has been objected, secondly, "It is mere cowardice

and fear of persecution which makes you desire to remain united with them."

This cannot be proved. Let every one examine his own heart, and not judge his brother.

It is not probable. We never yet, for any persecution, when we we were in the midst of it, either turned back from the work, or even slackened our pace.

But this is certain: that although persecution many times proves an unspeakable blessing to them that suffer it, yet we ought not wilfully to bring it upon ourselves. Nay, we ought to do whatever can lawfully be done, in order to prevent it. We ought, to avoid it so far as we lawfully can, when persecuted in one city, to flee into another. If God should suffer a general persecution, who would be able to abide it, we know not. Perhaps those who talk loudest might flee first. Remember the case of Dr. Pendleton.

III. Upon the whole, one cannot but observe, how desirable it is, that all of us who are engaged in the same work, should think and speak the same thing, be united in one judgment, and use one and the same language.

Do we not all now see *ourselves*, the *Methodists* (so called) in general, *the Church*, and *the clergy* in a clear light?

We look upon *ourselves*, not as the authors, or ringleaders of a particular sect or party; (it is the farthest thing from our thoughts:) but as messengers of God, to those who are Christians in name, but Heathens in heart and in life, to call them back to that from which they are fallen, to real, genuine Christianity. We are therefore debtors to all these, of whatever opinion or denomination: and are consequently to do all that in us lies, to please all, for their good to edification.

We look upon the Methodists (so called) in general, not as any particular party: (this would exceedingly obstruct the grand design, for which we conceive God has raised them up) but as living witnesses in, and to every party, of that Christianity which we preach; which is hereby demonstrated to be a real thing, and visibly held out to all the world.

We look upon England as that part of the world, and *the Church* as that part of England, to which all we, who were born and have been brought up therein, owe our first and chief regard. We feel in ourselves a strong Στοργη, a kind of natural affection for our country, which we apprehend Christianity was never designed either to root out, or to impair. We have a more peculiar concern for our brethren, for that part of our countrymen, to whom we have been joined from our youth up, by ties of a religious as well as a civil nature. True it is, that they are in general, *without God in the world.* So much the more do our bowels yearn over them. They do lie *in darkness and the shadow of death.* The more tender is our compassion for them. And when we have the fullest conviction of that complicated wickedness which covers them as a flood, then do we feel the most (and we desire to feel yet more) of that inexpressible emotion, with which our blessed Lord beheld Jerusalem, and wept and lamented over it. Then are we the most willing *to spend and to be spent* for them, yea, to *lay down our lives for our brethren.*

We look upon the *clergy,* not only as part of these our brethren, but as that part whom God by his adorable providence, has called to be watchmen over the rest, for whom therefore they are to give a strict account. If these then neglect their important charge, if they do not watch over them with all their power, they will be of all men most miserable, and so are entitled to our deepest compassion. So that to feel, and much more to express either contempt or bitterness towards them, betrays an utter ignorance of ourselves and of the spirit which we especially should be of. Because this is a point of uncommon concern, let us consider it a little farther.

The clergy, wherever we are, are either friends to the truth, or neuters, or enemies to it.

If they are friends to it, certainly we should do every thing, and omit every thing we can with a safe conscience, in order to continue, and if it be possible, increase their good-will to it.

If they neither further nor hinder it, we should do all that in us lies, both for their sakes and for the sake of their several flocks, to give their neutrality the right turn, that it may change into love rather than hatred.

If they are enemies, still we should not despair of lessening, if not removing their prejudice. We should try every means again and again. We should employ all our care, labour, prudence, joined with fervent prayer, to overcome evil with good, to melt their hardness into love.

It is true, that when any of these openly wrest the Scriptures, and deny the grand truths of the gospel, we cannot but declare and defend, at convenient opportunities, the important truths which they deny. But in this case especially we have need of all gentleness and meekness of wisdom. Contempt, sharpness, bitterness, can do no good. *The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.* Harsh methods have been tried again and again, (by two or three unsettled railers,) at Wednesbury, St. Ives, Cork, Canterbury. And how did they succeed? They always occasioned numberless evils; often wholly stopped the course of the gospel. Therefore, were it only on a prudential account, were conscience unconcerned therein, it should be a sacred rule to all our preachers, *No contempt, no bitterness to the clergy.*

2. Might it not be another (at least prudential) rule, for every Methodist preacher, *Not to frequent any dissenting meeting?* Though we blame none who have been always accustomed to it,) but if *we* do this, certainly our people will. Now this is actually separating from the Church. If therefore it is (at least) not expedient to separate, neither is this expedient. Indeed we may attend our assemblies, and the Church too; because they are at different hours. But we cannot attend both the meeting and the Church, because they are at the same hours.

If it be said, "But at the church we are fed with chaff, whereas at the meeting we have wholesome food:" we answer, 1. The prayers of the Church are not chaff: they are substantial food for any who are alive to God. 2. The

Lord's Supper is not chaff, but pure and wholesome for all who receive it with upright hearts. Yea, 3. In almost all the sermons we hear there, we hear many great and important truths. And whoever has a spiritual discernment, may easily separate the chaff from the wheat therein. 4. How little is the case mended at the meeting! Either the teachers are *new light men*, denying the Lord that bought them, and overturning his gospel from the very foundations: or they are Predestinarians, and so preach predestination and final perseverance, more or less. Now whatever this may be to them who were educated therein, yet to those of our brethren who have lately embraced it, repeated experience shews it is not wholesome food: rather to them it has the effect of deadly poison. In a short time it destroys all their zeal for God. They grow fond of opinions and strife of words. They despise self-denial and the daily cross; and, to complete all, wholly separate from their brethren.

3. Nor is it expedient for any Methodist preacher, to imitate the Dissenters in their manner of praying, either in his *tone*: all particular tones both in prayer and preaching should be avoided with the utmost care: nor in his *language*: all his words should be plain and simple, such as the lowest of his hearers both use and understand: or in the *length* of his prayer, which should not usually exceed four or five minutes, either before or after sermon. One might add, neither should we sing, like them in a slow, drawling manner: we sing swift, both because it saves time, and because it tends to awake and enliven the soul.

4. Fourthly, If we continue in the church not by chance, or for want of thought, but upon solid and well weighed reasons, then we should never speak contemptuously of the Church, or any thing pertaining to it. In some sense it is the mother of us all, who have been brought up therein. We ought never to make her blemishes matter of diversion, but rather of solemn sorrow before God. We ought never to talk ludicrously of them; no, not at all, without clear necessity. Rather, we should conceal them, as far as ever

we can, without bringing guilt upon our own consciences. And we should all use every rational and scriptural means, to bring others to the same temper and behaviour. I say, *all:* for if some of us are thus minded, and others of an opposite spirit and behaviour, this will breed a real schism among ourselves. It will of course divide us into two parties; each of which will be liable to perpetual jealousies, suspicions, and animosities against the other. Therefore on this account likewise, it is expedient in the highest degree, that we should be tender of the Church to which we belong.

5. In order to secure this end, to cut off all jealousy and suspicion from our friends, and hope from our enemies, of our having any design to separate from the Church, it would be well for every Methodist preacher, who has no scruple concerning it, to attend the service of the Church as often as conveniently he can. And the more we attend it, the more we love it, as constant experience shews. On the contrary, the longer we abstain from it, the less desire we have to attend it at all.

6. Lastly, Whereas we are surrounded on every side, by those who are equally enemies to us and to the Church of England; and whereas these are long practised in this war, and skilled in all the objections against it: while our brethren on the other hand are quite strangers to them all, and so on a sudden know not how to answer them: it is highly expedient for every preacher to be provided with sound answers to those objections, and then to instruct the societies where he labours, how to defend themselves against those assaults. It would be therefore well for you carefully to read over the *Preservative against unsettled Notions in Religion*, together with *Serious Thoughts concerning Perseverance, and Predestination calmly considered.* And when you are masters of them yourselves, it will be easy for you to recommend and explain them to our societies: that they may *no more be tost to and fro by every wind of doctrine;* but being settled in one mind and one judg-

ment, by solid scriptural and rational arguments, *may grow up in all things into him who is our head, even Jesus Christ.*

JOHN WESLEY.

I THINK myself bound in duty to add my testimony to my Brother's. His twelve reasons against our ever separating from the Church of England, are mine also. I subscribe to them with all my heart. Only with regard to the first, *I* am quite clear, that it is neither expedient, nor *lawful* for *Me* to separate: and I never had the least inclination or temptation so to do. My affection for the Church is as strong as ever: and I clearly see my calling; which is, to live and to die in her communion. This, therefore, I am determined to do, the Lord being my helper.

CHARLES WESLEY.

Thoughts on Separation from the Church.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

The question properly refers (when we speak of a separation from the Church) to a *total* and *immediate* separation, such was that of Mr. Ingham's people first, and afterwards that of Lady Huntingdon's, who all agreed to form themselves into a separate body *without delay:* to go to church no more, and to have no more connexion with the Church of England, than with the Church of Rome.

Such a separation I have always declared against, and certainly it will not take place (if ever it does) while I live. But a kind of separation has already taken place and will inevitably spread, though by slow degrees. Those ministers, so called, who neither live nor preach the gospel, I dare not say, are sent of God. Where one of these is settled, many of the Methodists dare not attend his ministry; so if there be no other church in that neighbourhood, they go to church no more. This is the case in a

few places already, and it will be the case in more, and no one can justly blame *me* for this, neither is it contrary to any of my professions.

J. W.

Bristol, Sept. 20, 1788.

On the Church: in a Letter to the Rev. ———.

Plymouth Dock, Aug. 19, 1785.

REV. SIR,

I WILL tell you my thoughts with all simplicity, and wait for better information. If you agree with me, well: if not, we can (as Mr. Whitefield used to say) agree to disagree.

For these forty years I have been in doubt concerning that question: "What Obedience is due to Heathenish Priests and Mitred Infidels?"

I have from time to time proposed my doubts to the most pious and sensible Clergymen I knew. But they gave me no satisfaction: rather they seemed to be puzzled as well as I. Some obedience I always paid to the Bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land. But I cannot see, that I am under any obligation to obey them farther than those laws require.

It is in obedience to those laws, that I have never exercised in England, the power which I believe God has given me. I firmly believe, I am a scriptural Επισκοπος as much as any man in England or in Europe. (For the *Uninterrupted Succession* I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.) But this does in no wise interfere with my remaining in the Church of England: from which I have no more desire to separate than I had fifty years ago. I still attend all the Ordinances of the Church, at all opportunities. And I constantly and earnestly desire all that are connected with me so to do. When Mr. Smyth pressed us to "separate from the Church," he meant, "Go to Church no more." And this was what I meant seven and twenty years ago, when I persuaded our brethren "Not to sepa-

rate from the Church." But here another question occurs, "What is the Church of England?" It is not "all the people of England." Papists and Dissenters are no part thereof. It is not all the people of England except Papists and Dissenters. Then we should have a glorious Church indeed! No: according to our twentieth article, a particular Church is "a congregation of faithful people (*Cœtus credentium*, the words in our Latin edition) among whom the Word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered." Here is a true logical definition, containing both the essence and the properties of a Church. What then, according to this definition, is the Church of England? Does it mean, "All the believers in England, (except the Papists and Dissenters) who have the Word of God and the sacraments duly administered among them?" I fear this does not come up to your idea of "The Church of England." Well, what more do you include in that phrase?" "Why, all the believers that adhere to the doctrine and discipline established by the Convocation under Queen Elizabeth." Nay, that discipline is well nigh vanished away, and the doctrine both you and I adhere to.

All those reasons against a separation from the Church in this sense, I subscribe to still. What then are you frightened at? I no more separate from it now, than I did in the year 1758. I submit still (though sometimes with a doubting conscience) to Mitred Infidels. I do indeed vary from them in some points of doctrine and in some points of discipline, (by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming societies.) But not a hair's breadth further than I believe to be meet, right, and my bounden duty. I walk still by the same rule I have done for between forty and fifty years. I do nothing rashly. It is not likely I should. The high-day of my blood is over. If you will go hand in hand with me, do. But do not hinder me, if you will not help. Perhaps if you had kept closely to me, I might have done better. However, with or without help I creep on. And as I have been hitherto, so I trust I shall always be,

Your affectionate Friend and Brother,

JOHN WESLEY.

Farther Thoughts on Separation from the Church.

1. FROM a child I was taught to love and reverence the Scriptures, the Oracles of God: and next to these, to esteem the Primitive Fathers, the Writers of the three first centuries. Next after the Primitive Church, I esteemed our own, the Church of England, as the most scriptural, national Church in the world. I therefore, not only assented to all the doctrines, but observed all the rubric in the Liturgy: and that with all possible exactness, even at the peril of my life.

2. In this judgment, and with this spirit I went to America, strongly attached to the Bible, the Primitive Church, and the Church of England, from which I would not vary in one jot or tittle on any account whatever. In this spirit I returned as regular a clergyman as any in the three kingdoms: till after not being permitted to preach in the Churches, I was constrained to *preach in the open air.*

3. Here was my first *irregularity*. And it was not voluntary but constrained. The second was *extemporary* prayer. This likewise I believed to be my bounden duty, for the sake of those who desired me to watch over their souls. I could not in conscience refrain from it: neither from accepting those, who desired to serve me *as sons in the Gospel.*

4. When the people joined together, simply to help each other to heaven, increased by hundreds and thousands, still they had no more thought of leaving the Church than of leaving the kingdom. Nay, I continually and earnestly cautioned them against it; reminding them that we were a part of the Church of England, whom God had raised up not only to save our own souls, but to enliven our neighbours, those of the Church in particular. And at the first meeting of all our Preachers in Conference, in June 1744, I exhorted them to keep to the Church, observing, that this was our peculiar glory, Not to form any new sect, but abiding in our own Church, to do to all men all the good we possibly could.

5. But as more Dissenters joined with us, many of whom were much prejudiced against the Church, these, with or without design, were continually infusing their own prejudices into their brethren. I saw this, and gave warning of it from time to time, both in private and in public. And in the year 1758, I resolved to bring the matter to a fair issue. So I desired the point might be considered at large, Whether it was expedient for the Methodists to leave the Church? The arguments on both sides were discussed for several days; and at length we agreed, without a dissenting voice, "It is by no means expedient that the Methodists should leave the Church of England."

6. Nevertheless, the same leaven continued to work, in various parts of the kingdom. The grand argument (which in some particular cases must be acknowledged to have weight) was this: "The minister of the parish wherein we dwell, neither lives nor preaches the Gospel. He walks in the way to hell himself, and teaches his flock to do the same. Can you advise them to attend his preaching?" I cannot advise them to it. "What then can they do, on the Lord's-day, suppose no other Church be near? Do you advise them to go to a dissenting Meeting? Or to meet in their own Preaching-house?" Where this is really the case, I cannot blame them if they do. Although, therefore, I earnestly oppose the *general* separation of the Methodists from the Church, yet I cannot condemn such a *partial* separation, in this particular case. I believe to separate thus far from these miserable wretches, who are the scandal of our Church and nation, would be for the honour of our Church, as well as to the glory of God.

7. And this is no way contrary to the profession which I have made above these fifty years. I never had any design of separating from the Church. I have no such design now. I do not believe, the Methodists in general design it, when I am no more seen. I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many of them will separate from it; (although I am apt to think, not one half, perhaps not a third

of them.) These will be so bold and injudicious, as to form a separate party, which consequently will dwindle away, into a dry, dull, separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England: and that none who regard my judgment or advice, will ever separate from it.

JOHN WESLEY.

London, Dec. 11, 1789.

Thoughts on the Consecration of CHURCHES, *and* BURIAL-GROUNDS.

1. IT has been a custom for some ages, in Roman Catholic countries to have a particular form of consecration, for all Churches and Chapels: and not for these only, but for every thing pertaining to them; such as fonts, chalices, bells, sacerdotal vestments, and church-yards in particular. And all these customs universally prevailed in England, as long as it was under the papal power.

2. From the time of our Reformation from Popery, most of these customs fell into disuse. Unconsecrated bells were rung without scruple, and unconsecrated vestments worn. But some of them remained still: the consecration of churches and church-yards in particular: and many scrupled the performing divine service in an *unconsecrated church*: and could not consent that their bodies should be buried in *unconsecrated ground.*

3. Accordingly the consecrating of churches and church-yards has been practised in England ever since. But it is a thing purely indifferent, being neither forbidden, nor established by law. The case is different in Ireland. While the Earl of Stafford was lord-lieutenant of that kingdom, a law was made for the *consecration* not only of churches, but of church-yards also. And a Form of Consecration for both was inserted in the Common Prayer-book, which is used at this day: much resembling that

which Archbishop Laud used, in the consecration of St. Katherine-Creed's Church in London.

4. But such a law has never passed in England, much less been inserted in our Common Prayer-book. However, such consecration has been generally practised, though not authorised by the Legislature. "Is it then illegal?" That word is capable of a two-fold meaning. It may mean, either *without* any law in its favour, or against law. I do not conceive it to be illegal, in the latter sense. Perhaps it is in the former: I do not know any law that enjoins, or even permits it.

5. And certainly as it is not enjoined by the law of the land, so it is not enjoined by the law of God. Where do we find one word in the New Testament enjoining any such thing? Neither do I remember any precedent of it in the purest ages of the Church. It seems to have entered, and gradually spread itself, with the other innovations and superstitions of the Church of Rome. "Do you think it then a superstitious practice?" Perhaps it is not, if it be practised as a thing indifferent. But if it be done as a *necessary* thing, then it is flatly superstitious.

6. For this reason I never wished that any bishop should consecrate any chapel or burial-ground of mine. Indeed I should not dare to suffer it; as I am clearly persuaded, the thing is wrong in itself, being not authorized either by any law of God, or by any law of the land. In consequence of which I conceive, that either the clerk or the sexton, may as well consecrate the Church, or the church-yard, as the bishop.

7. With regard to the latter, the church-yard, I know not who could answer that plain question: you say, "This is *consecrated ground*, so many feet *broad*, and so many *long*." But pray, how *deep* is the consecrated ground?—"Deep! What does that signify?" O, a great deal! for if any grave be dug too *deep*, I may happen to get out of the *consecrated ground!* And who can tell, what unhappy consequences may follow from this!

8. I take the whole of this practice, to be a mere relic of

Romish superstition. And I wonder that any sensible Protestant should think it right to countenance it: much more that any reasonable man should plead for the necessity of it! Surely it is high time now, that we should be guided, not by custom, but by Scripture and Reason.

Dumfries, May 14, 1788. J. W.

An Answer to an Important Question.

Armagh, June 18, 1787.

DEAR SIR,

You ask, "Why do not the Clergy, whether in England or Ireland, avail themselves of the Methodist Preachers?" You say, "You wonder they do not thankfully accept of their assistance, who desire no pay for their service, in repressing error and wickedness of every kind, and propagating truth and religion?" You inquire "upon what rational principles can this be accounted for?"

To give a complete answer to this question, would require a whole treatise. I have not leisure for this: but I will give as full an answer as my time will permit.

Only before I answer, I must observe, that many both of the English and Irish Clergy, are entirely out of the question. They are not only learned, but truly religious men, and, as such, are an honour to their profession. I speak only of those that are of a different character, be they many or few. Let them wear the cap whom it fits. That is no concern of mine.

This premised, I think it easy to be accounted for, even upon heathen principles. Horace observed long ago,

Oderunt hilarem tristes, tristemq; jocosi,
Vinosi porrecta negantem pocula—

Accordingly, grave and solemn men (though too few are guilty of this fault) dislike many of the Methodist Preachers, for having nothing of *that* gravity or solemnity about them. Jocose Clergymen, on the other hand, cannot but dislike those, who are steadily serious. And those that love to

take a cheerful glass, are not fond of such as are strictly temperate. You need go no farther than this consideration to have a clear answer to the question, "Why do many of the Clergy refuse to have any assistance from the Methodist Preachers?"

But this may be more fully accounted for upon Christian principles. What says our Lord, to the first Preachers of the Gospel, and in them to all their successors? (John xv. 18, and seq.) "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me, before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you. These things will they do unto you, because they know not him that sent me."

Does not this give us sufficient reason to expect, that if we are *not of the world*, all *the world*, all who *know not God*, whether Clergy or Laity, will be so far from accepting our assistance, that they will sincerely hate us, and openly or privately, persecute us, so far as God permits? We have, therefore, reason to wonder, not that they do not desire any union or coalition with us, but that they bear with, yea, and on many occasions treat us with courtesy and civility. This is a peculiar instance of the providence of God, causing in some measure the scandal of the cross to cease.

"But do not many Clergymen, who are not pious men, acknowledge that the Methodists do good, and encourage them to persevere therein?" They do: but observe how far they would have them go. They wish them to repress outward sin: to reclaim the people from cursing, and swearing, and drunkenness, and sabbath-breaking, (unless the squire gains by it.) They are well pleased, that their parishioners grow more diligent and honest, and are constant attendants on the Church and Sacrament. Nay, they are glad that they are brought to practise both justice and mercy; in a word, to be *moral men*.

But the truth is, the Methodists know and teach, that all this is nothing before God: that whoever goes thus far and

no farther, is *building upon the sand:* that he who would worship God to any purpose, must worship him *in spirit and in truth:* that true religion is *righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost:* even giving God our hearts: the seeking and finding happiness in him. Here then they divide from the Methodists, whom they judge to be going too far. They would have their parishioners *moral men;* that is, in plain terms, honest heathens, but they would not have them *pious* men, men devoted to God, *Bible Christians.* If therefore the Methodist Preachers would stop here, would preach outward religion and no more, many Clergymen would not only encourage them therein, but likewise cordially join them. But when they persuade men, *not* to be *almost, but altogether Christians,* to maintain a constant *fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ:* to be *transformed* into that *image of God, wherein they were created,* and thenceforth to live that *life which is hid with Christ in God:* let them not expect, that any will give them the right hand of fellowship, but those God hath *chosen out of the world.*

I am, your's, &c.

J. W.

Free Thoughts

ON THE

PRESENT STATE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso. HOR.

YOU desire me to give you my thoughts freely on the present state of public affairs. But do you consider? I am no politician: politics lie quite out of my province. Neither have I any acquaintance, at least no intimacy, with any that bear that character. And it is no easy matter to form any judgment concerning things of so complicated a nature. It is the more difficult, because in order to form our judgment, such a multitude of facts should be known, few of which can be known with tolerable exactness by any but those who are eye-witnesses of them. And how few of these will relate what they have seen precisely as it was, without adding, omitting, or altering any circumstance, either with or without design! And may not a slight addition or alteration give a quite different colour to the whole?

And as we cannot easily know with any accuracy, the facts on which we are chiefly to form our judgment, so much less can we expect to know the various springs of action which gave rise to those facts, and on which more than on

the bare actions themselves, the characters of the actors depend. It is on this account that an old writer advises us to *judge nothing before the time;* to abstain as far as possible from judging peremptorily, either of things or persons, till the time comes, when *the hidden things of darkness*, the facts now concealed, will be brought to light, and the hidden springs of action will be discovered, *the thoughts and intents of every human heart.*

Perhaps you will say, "Nay, every Englishman is a politician; we suck in politics with our mother's milk. It is as natural for us to talk politics as to breathe: we can instruct both the king and his council. We can in a trice reform the state, point out every blunder of this or that minister, and tell every step they ought to take to be arbiters of all Europe."

I grant, every cobbler, tinker, porter, and hackney-coachman, can do this. But I am not so *deep-learned:* while they are sure of every thing, I am in a manner sure of nothing; except of that very little which I see with my own eyes, or hear with my own ears. However, since you desire me to tell you what I think, I will do it with all openness. Only please to remember, I do not take upon me to *dictate* either to you or to any one. I only use the privilege of an Englishman, to speak my naked thoughts: setting down just what appears to me to be the truth, till I have better information.

At present, indeed, I have not much information, having read little upon this head but the public papers. And you know, these are mostly on one side; in them little is to be seen on the other side. And that little is seldom written by *masterly* writers. How few of them have such a pen as Junius!

But supposing we have ever so much information, how little can one rely on it! On the information given by either party! For is not one as warm as the other? And who does not know how impossible it is for a man to see things right, when he is angry? Does not passion blind the eyes of the understanding, as smoke does the bodily eyes?

And how little of the truth can we learn from those, who see nothing but through a cloud!

This advantage then I have over both parties, the being angry at neither. So that if I have a little understanding from nature or experience, it is (in this instance at least) unclouded by passion. I wish the same happiness which I wish to myself, to those on one side and on the other. I would not hurt either, in the least degree; I would not willingly give them any pain.

I have likewise another advantage, that of having no bias one way or the other. I have no interest depending: I want no man's favour, having no hopes, no fears from any man: and having no particular attachment of any kind, to either of the contending parties.

But am I so weak as to imagine, that because I am not angry at *them*, they will not be angry at *me?* No, I do not imagine any such thing. Probably *both* will be angry enough; that is, the warm men on both sides, were it only for this, that I am not as warm as themselves. For what is more insufferable to a man in a passion, than to see you keep your temper? And is it not a farther provocation, that I do not behave as he does to his opponent? That I call him no ill names? That I give him no ill words? I expect therefore to be abused on all sides; and cannot be disappointed, unless by being treated with common humanity.

This premised, I come to the point, to give you my *Free Thoughts on the present State of Public Affairs*, the *causes* and *consequences* of the present commotions. But permit me to remind you, that I say nothing peremptorily. I do not take upon me to affirm, that things are thus or thus. I just set down my naked thoughts, and that without any art or colouring.

"What then do you think is the direct and principal *cause* of the present public commotions, of the amazing ferment among the people, the general discontent of the nation?" which now rises to a higher degree than it has done in the memory of man; insomuch that I have head it

affirmed with my own ears, "King George ought to be treated as King Charles was." Is it the extraordinary bad character of the King? I do not apprehend it is. Certainly if he is not, as some think, the *best* Prince in Europe, he is far from being the *worst*. One not greatly prejudiced in his favour, does not charge him with want of *virtue* (of this he judges him to have *more than enough,)* but with wanting those *royal vices*, which (with Machiavel and the ingenious Doctor Mandeville) he supposes would be *public benefits*.

"But does he not likewise want *understanding?*" So it has been boldly affirmed. And it must be acknowledged this charge is supported by facts, which cannot be denied. The first is, he believes the bible: the second, he fears God; the third, he loves the Queen. Now suppose the first of these, considering the prejudice of education, might consist with some share of understanding, yet how can this be allowed with regard to the second? For although in the times of ignorance and barbarism, men imagined, *the fear of God* was *the beginning of wisdom*, our enlightened age has discovered it is the *end* of it: that whenever the fear of God begins, wisdom is at an end. And with regard to the third, for a man to love his wife, unless perhaps for a month or two, must argue such utter want of sense, as most men of rank are now ashamed of. But after all, there are some, who, allowing the facts, deny the consequence. Who still believe, and that after the most accurate inquiry, from such as have had the best means of information, that there are few noblemen or gentlemen in the nation, (and we have many not inferior to most in Europe) who have either so good a natural understanding, or so general a knowledge of all the valuable parts of learning.

"But suppose something might be said for his Majesty's understanding, what can be said in excuse of his *bad actions?* As first, his pardoning a murderer?" I really think something may be said on this head also. Can you or I believe, that the King knew him to be such? Understood him to be a wilful murderer? I am not sure of it at all: neither

have you any rational proof: (even supposing this to have been the case, which is far from being clear.) And if he did not know or believe him to be such, how can he be blamed for pardoning him? Not to have pardoned him in this case, would have been inexcusable before God and man.

"But what can be said in excuse of his being *governed by his mother*, and fixing all his measures at *Carlton house?*" It may be said, that if it was so, it is past, and so is no matter of present complaint. But who informed you that it was? Any eye and ear witness? "O, it is in every body's mouth." Very well: but every body is no body: so this proof is no proof at all. And what better proof have you, or any man, of his fixing any of his measures there? This has been affirmed a hundred times, but never was proved yet. "Nay, but is it not an undeniable fact, that he spent hour after hour with her? And especially when he was hard pressed, and knew not which way to turn?" And what then? Who loves him better than his parent? And whom has he a right to love better than her? Who is more faithful to him, more steadily desirous of his welfare? And whom can he trust better? Suppose then it was true, (which is more than any man can prove,) that he did consult her on all occasions, and particularly when he was in trouble and perplexity, who can blame him for so doing?

"Well, be this as it may, who can help blaming him for giving so many *pensions?*" This is a thing which I do not understand, and can therefore neither praise nor blame. Some indeed, I think, are *well bestowed*, on men eminent in their several professions. All, I believe, are *well designed*, particularly those given to men who are removed from public employments. Yet, I fear, some of these are *ill bestowed*, on those who not only fly in the face of their benefactor, but avail themselves of his favours to wound the deeper. "For were he not in the wrong, these would never turn against him!" What pity they should enjoy them another day, after such foul and flagrant ingratitude!

This fault (if it were really such) would argue too great

easiness of temper. But this is quite the reverse of what is commonly objected, *inflexible stubbornness*. "Nay, what else could occasion the settled disregard of so many *petitions* and *remonstrances*, signed by so many thousands of hands, and declaring the sense of the nation." *The sense of the nation!* Who can imagine this, that knows the manner wherein nine in ten, I might say, ninety-nine in a hundred, of those petitions are procured? A lord or squire (sometimes two or more) goes or sends his steward, round the town where his seat is, with a paper, which he tells the honest men is for the good of their king and country. He desires each to set his name or mark to this. And who has the hardiness to gainsay; especially if my lord keeps open house? Mean time the contents of it they know nothing about.

I was not long since in a town in Kent, when one of these petitions was carrying about. I asked one and another, "Have you signed the petition?" And found none that had refused it. And yet not one single person to whom I spoke, had either read it or heard it read.

Now I would ask any man of common sense, what stress is to be laid on these petitions? And how do they declare the *sense of the nation?* Nay, of the very persons that have signed them? What a shocking insult is it then on the whole kingdom, to palm these petitions upon us, of which the very subscribers have not read three lines, as the general *sense of the nation?*

But suppose they had read all that they have subscribed, what judges are they of these matters? To put this beyond dispute, let us only propose one case out of a thousand. Step back a few years, and suppose Mr. Pitt at the head of the administration. Here comes up a petition from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, signed by five hundred hands, begging his Majesty to dismiss that minister, who was taking such measures as tended to the utter ruin of the nation. What could Mr. Pitt say to this? Would he not ask, "How came these colliers and keelmen to be so well acquainted

with the affairs of state? How long have they been judges of public administration? Of naval and military operations? How came they to understand the propriety or impropriety of the measures I take? Do they comprehend the balance of Europe? Do they know the weakness and strength of its several kingdoms? The characters of the monarchs and their ministers? The springs of this and that public motion? Else, why do they take upon them to scan my conduct? *Ne sutor ultra crepidam!* Let them mind their own work, keep to their pits and keels, and leave state affairs to *me*.

"But surely you do not place the citizens of London on a level with the colliers of Newcastle?" I do not. And yet I suppose they were equally incompetent judges of the measures which Mr. Pitt took. And I doubt they are fully as incompetent judges of the measures taken by the present ministry. To form a tolerable judgment of them, requires not only a good understanding, but more time than common tradesmen can spare, and better information than they can possibly procure. I think, therefore, that the encouraging them to pass their verdict on ministers of state, yea, on King, Lords, and Commons, is not only putting them out of their way, but doing them more mischief than you are aware of.

"But the *remonstrance!* Surely the King ought to have paid more regard to the remonstrance of the *city of London*." Consider the case: the city had presented a petition, which he could by no means approve of, as he judged it was designed not so much to *inform* him, as to inflame his subjects. After he had rejected this, as mildly as could be done, whilst he viewed it in this light, they present a remonstance to the same effect, and (as he judged) with the same design. What then could he do less than he did? Could he *seem* to approve what he did not approve? If not, how could he testify his full disapprobation in more inoffensive terms?

As to the idle, shameless tale of his bursting out into

laughter at the magistrates, any who know his Majesty's temper, would as soon believe that he spit in their faces, or struck them a box on the ear.

His Majesty's character then, after all the pains which have been taken to make him odious, as well as contemptible, remains unimpeached; and therefore cannot be in any degree the cause of the present commotions. His whole conduct, both in public and private, ever since he began his reign, the uniform tenor of his behaviour, the general course both of his words and actions, has been worthy of an Englishman, worthy of a Christian, and worthy of a King.

"Are not then the present commotions owing to his having *extraordinary bad ministers?* Can you say that his ministers are as blameless as himself?" I do not say this: I do not think so. But I think they are not one jot worse than those that went before them: nor than any set of ministers who have been in place for at least thirty years last past. I think they are not a jot worse than their opponents, than those who bawl the loudest against them, either with regard to intellectual or moral abilities, with regard to sense or honesty. Set twenty against twenty, or ten against ten; and is there a pin to choose?

"However, are not these commotions owing to the *extraordinary bad measures* they have taken? Surely you will not attempt to defend all their measures!" No indeed. I do not defend *general warrants*. But I observe, 1. The giving these, be it good or bad, is no *extraordinary* measure. Has it not been done by all ministers for many years, and that with little or no objection? 2. This ordinary measure is of exceedingly little importance to the nation in general: so little, that it was never before thought worthy to be put into the list of public grievances: so little, that it never deserved the hundredth part of the outcry, which has been made concerning it.

I do not defend the *killing* of Mr. Allen. But I would have the fact truly represented. By the best information I can gain, I believe it stands just thus: About that time the

mob had been very turbulent. On that day they were likely to be more insolent than ever. It was therefore judged proper to send a party of soldiers, to prevent or repress their violence. Their presence did not prevent it: the mob went so far as to throw stones at the soldiers themselves. One of them hit and wounded a soldier: two or three pursued him: and fired at one whom, being in the same dress, they supposed to be the same man. But it was not; it was Mr. Allen. Now though this cannot be excused, yet, was it the most horrid villainy that ever was perpetrated? Surely not. Notwithstanding all the tragical exclamations which have been made concerning it, what is this to the killing a man in cool blood? And was this never heard of in England?

I do not defend the measures which have been taken relative to the *Middlesex Election*. But let it be remembered, 1st, That there was full as much violence on the one side as on the other: 2dly, That a right of *expulsion*, of *putting* a member out of the House, manifestly implies a right of *exclusion*, of *keeping* him out; otherwise that right amounts to just nothing at all: 3dly, That consequently a member expelled is incapable of being re-elected, at least during that session; as incapable as one that is disqualified any other way. It follows, 4thly, That the votes given for this disqualified person, are null and void, being in effect given for nobody. Therefore, 5thly, If the other candidate had two hundred votes, he had a majority of two hundred.

Let it be observed farther, if the electors had the liberty of choosing *any qualified person*, it is absolute nonsense to talk of their "being deprived of the liberty of choosing;" because they were not permitted to choose *a person utterly unqualified*.

But suppose a single borough or county were deprived of this in a single instance: (which undoubtedly is the case, whenever a person duly elected does not sit in the House:) How is this "depriving the good people of England, the *Nation* of their *Birth-right*?" What an insult upon com-

mon sense is this wild way of talking! If Middlesex is wronged (put it so) in this instance, how is Yorkshire or Cumberland affected by it? Or twenty counties and forty boroughs besides? Much less *all the nation?* O, but they "may be affected by and by." Very true! And the sky may fall!

To see this whole matter in the clearest light, let any one read and consider the speech of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, on a motion made by Lord Chatham, "To repeal and rescind the resolutions of the House of Commons, in regard to the expulsion and incapacitation of Mr. Wilkes."

"In this debate, though it has already been spoken to with great eloquence and perspicuity, I cannot content myself with only giving a single vote; I feel myself under a strong necessity of saying something more. The subject requires it, and though the hour is late, [*it being then near ten o'clock,*] I shall demand your indulgence, while I offer my sentiments on this motion.

"I am sure, my lords, many of you must remember, from your reading and experience, several persons expelled the House of Commons without ever this House once pretending to interfere, or call in question by what authority they did so. I remember several myself, [*here his lordship quoted several cases,*] in all which, though most of the candidates were sure to be *re-chosen*, they never once applied, resting contented with the expulsatory power of the House, as the *only self-sufficient dernier resort* of application.

"It has been echoed on all sides, from the partizans of this motion, that the House of Commons acted illegally, in accepting Col. Luttrel, who had but 296 votes, in preference to Mr. Wilkes, who had 1143. But this is a mistake of the grossest nature imaginable, and which nothing but the intemperature of people's zeal could possibly transport them to, as Mr. Wilkes had been previously considered by the laws as an unqualified person to represent the people in parliament; therefore it appears very plainly, that Col. Luttrel had a very great majority, not less than 296, Mr.

Wilkes being considered as nobody in the eye of the law; consequently Col. Luttrel had no legal opposition.

"In all contested elections, where one of the parties think themselves not legally treated, I should be glad to know to whom it is they resort? Is it to the freeholders of the borough, or the county they would represent? Or is it to the people at large? Who cannot see, at once, the absurdity of such a question? Who so ignorant of our laws, that cannot immediately reply and say, 'It is the House of Commons who are the only judges to determine every nicety of the laws of election; and from whom there is no appeal, after they have once given their determination?' All the freeholder has to do, is to determine on his object, by giving him his vote; the ultimate power lies with the House of Commons, who is to judge of his being a legal object of representation in the several branches of his qualifications. This, my lords, I believe, is advancing no new doctrine, nor adding an iota to the privilege of a member of the House of Commons, more than what the constitution long ago has given him; yet here is a cry made, in a case that directly applies to what I have been speaking of, as if it was illegal, arbitrary, and unprecedented.

"I do not remember, my lords, in either the course of my reading or observation, ever to have known an instance of a person's being re-chosen, after being expelled, till the year 1711; then, indeed, my memory serves me with the case of Sir Robert Walpole. He was expelled the House of Commons, and was afterwards re-chosen; but this last event did not take place till the meeting of the next parliament; and during that interval, I find no debate about the illegality of his expulsion, no interference of the House of Lords, nor any addresses from the public, to decry that measure by a dissolution of parliament.

"Indeed, as for the precedent of one House interfering with the rules, orders, or business of another, my memory does not serve me at present with the recollection of a single one. As to the case of Titus Oates, as mentioned by the noble lord in my eye, (Lord Chatham,) he is very

much mistaken in regard to the mode; his was a trial in the King's-Bench, which, on a writ of error, the House of Commons interfered in, and they had an authority for so doing. A judge certainly may be mistaken in points of law, the wisest and the best of us may be so at times, and it reflects no discredit; on the contrary, it does particular honour, when he finds himself so mistaken, to reverse his own decree. But for one House of Parliament interfering with the business, and reversing the resolutions of another, it is not only unprecedented, but unconstitutional to the last degree.

"But suppose, my lords, that this house coincided with this motion; suppose we all agreed *nem. con.* to repeal and rescind the resolutions of the House of Commons, in regard to the expulsion and incapacitation of Mr. Wilkes;" —Good God! What may be the consequence? The people are violent enough already, and to have the superior branch of legislation join them, would be giving such a public encouragement to their proceedings, that I almost tremble, while I even suppose such a scene of anarchy and confusion."

"What then can we think of the violent outcry, That the nation is oppressed, deprived of that liberty which their ancestors bought with so much treasure and blood, and delivered down through so many generations?" Do those who raise this cry believe what they say? If so, are they not under the highest infatuation? Seeing that England, from the time of William the Conqueror, yea, of Julius Cæsar, never enjoyed such liberty, civil and religious, as it does at this day. Nor do we know of any other kingdom or state in Europe, or in the world, which enjoys the like.

I do not defend the measures which have been taken with regard to America; I doubt whether any man can defend them, either on the foot of law, equity, or prudence. But whose measures were these? If I do not mistake, Mr. George Grenville's. Therefore the whole merit of these measures belongs to him, and not to the present ministry.

"But is not the general dissatisfaction owing, if not to

any of the preceding causes, to the *extraordinary bad conduct* of the parliament, particularly the House of Commons?" This is set in so clear a light by a late writer, that I need only transcribe his words.

"The last recess of parliament was a period filled with unprecedented troubles: and the session opened in the midst of tumults. Ambitious men, with a perseverance uncommon in indolent and luxurious times, rung all the changes of popular noise, for the purpose of intimidation. The ignorant, who could not distinguish between real and artificial clamours, were alarmed; the lovers of their own ease wished to sacrifice the just dignity of the House of Commons to a temporary relief, from the grating sound of seditious scurrility.

"Hence the friends of the constitution saw the opening of the session with anxiety and apprehension. They were afraid of the timidity of others, and dreaded nothing more than that panic to which popular assemblies, as well as armies, are sometimes subject. The event has shewn that their fears were groundless: the house supported its decisions against the current of popular prejudice; and, in defending their own judicial rights, secured the most solid part of the liberties of their constituents.

"Their firm adherence to their resolutions was not more noble, than their concessions in the matter of their own rights was disinterested and generous. The extensive privileges, which, in a series of ages, had accumulated to the members of both houses, were certainly inconsistent with the impartial distribution of justice. To sacrifice these privileges was not only diametrically opposite to the idea of self-interest, with which some asperse the legislature, but it has also thrown a greater weight into the scale of public freedom than any other act passed since the revolution. And it has reflected honour on the present Administration, that a bill, so very favourable to the liberty of the subject, was brought in and carried through by them.

"The arbitrary manner of determining petitions about elections, has been a serious complaint and of long conti-

nuance. I shall not deny to Mr. Grenville the merit of bringing in a bill for remedying this grievance; but its passing as it did is a certain proof that the pretended influence of Administration over a majority of the House is a mere bugbear, held forth for private views by the present opposition.

"During the whole Session, the House of Lords behaved with that dignity and unalterable firmness which became the first assembly in a great nation. Attacked with impertinent scurrility, they smiled upon rage, and treated the ravings of a despotic tribune with contempt. When with an infamous perversion of his pretended love to freedom, he attempted to extend the control of the Peers to the resolutions of the representatives of the people, they nobly rejected the golden bait; and scorned to raise the dignity of their house upon the ruins of the other. They, in short, throughout the Session, shewed a spirit that disdained to be braved: a magnanimity that diminished their own personal power for the ease and comfort of the inferior subject.

"If the conduct of Parliament is in any instance blameable, it is in a lenity that is inconsistent with the vulgar idea of political courage. They have been attacked with scurrility in the Lower House; in the Upper they have been treated with indecency and disrespect. Their prudence and love for the public peace prevailed over their resentment. They knew that legal punishment is in these times the road to popularity, and they were unwilling to raise insignificant men into a consequence that might disturb the state."

So far we have gained. We have removed the *imaginary causes* of the present commotions. It plainly appears, they are not owing to the *extraordinary badness*, either of the King, of his Parliament, of his ministers, or of the measures which they have taken. To what then are they owing? What are the *real causes* of this amazing ferment among the people?

Before I say any thing on this subject, let me remind you

once more, that I do not *dictate*: I do not take upon me to *affirm* any thing, but simply tell you what I think. I think the first and principal spring of the whole motion is *French gold*. "But why do you think so?" I will tell you as plainly as I can.

A person of a complete uniform character, incumbered with no religion, with no regard to virtue or morality, squanders away all that he has. He applies for a place, but is disappointed. He is thoroughly exasperated, abuses the ministry, asperses the King's mother in the grossest manner, is prosecuted, (not for this, but other achievements,) and retires to France. After some time, he suddenly returns to London, sets up for a patriot, and vehemently inveighs against evil counsellors, grievances, and male-administration. The cry spreads: more and more espouse his cause, and second him with all their might. He becomes the head of the party; and not only the vulgar, but the world runs after him. He drives on with still increasing numbers, carrying all before him, inflaming the nation more and more, and making their minds evil-affected, in appearance towards the Ministers of state, but in reality towards the King. Now can any reasonable man believe, that the French are ignorant of all this? Or that they have no hand at all therein, but are mere unconcerned spectators? Do they not understand their own interest better? If they do not kindle the fire, will they not use all means to prevent its going out? Will they not take care to add fuel to the flame? Will they not think forty or fifty thousand Louis d'ors, well bestowed on so important an occasion?

I cannot but think this is (at least) one principal spring of all the present commotions. But may not other causes likewise concur? As, 1st, *Covetousness*: a love of English as well as of French gold. Do not many hunger after the lucrative employments which their neighbours enjoy? They had rather have them themselves. And will not those that are hungry naturally cry for food? 2dly, *Ambition*. How many desire honour, perhaps more than they do money

itself? And how various are the shapes which they will put on, in order to attain it? 3dly, Those who are not so much under the power of these, are yet susceptible of *Pride* or *Envy;* and frequently of both together. To these we may, 4thly, add *Resentment.* Many doubtless look upon themselves as injured, were it only on this account, that they are not regarded, yea and recompensed as their merits or services deserve. Others are *angry* because they are disappointed; because, after all their schemes, which they imagined could not fail of success, they are not able to carry their point.

Now all these, united by these various motives, some encouraged by good pay in hand, (and perhaps by promises of more,) others animated by covetousness, by ambition, by envy, pride, and resentment, by every means animate all they have access to. They treat both rich and poor (according to their rank) with all elegance and profuseness. They talk largely and vehemently. They write abundantly, having troops enough in their service. They publish *addresses, petitions, remonstrances,* directed *nominally* to the King, (otherwise they would not answer the end;) but *really* to the people. Herein their orators make use of all the powers of rhetoric. They bring forth their strong reasons, the very best which the cause will bear. They set them off with all the beauty of language, all the poignancy of wit. They spread their writings in pamphlets, newspapers, magazines, &c. to every corner of the land. They are indefatigable in their work; they never stop to take breath; but as they have tongues and pens at command, when one has done, another begins, and so on and on with a continuance. By this means the flame spreads wider and wider; it runs as fire among the stubble. The madness becomes epidemic, and no medicine hitherto has availed against it. The whole nation sees *the State in danger,* as they did the *Church* sixty years ago: and the world now *wanders after* Mr. Wilkes, as it did then after Dr. Sacheverel!

One means of increasing the ferment is, the suffering no contradiction: the hooting at all who labour for peace, and

treading them down like dirt: the using them just as they do the King, without either justice or mercy. If any writes on that head, presently the cry is raised, "O, he only writes *for pay*." But if he does, do not those on the other side too? Which are paid best, I do not know: but doubtless both are paid, a very few old-fashioned mortals excepted, who having nothing to hope, and nothing to fear, simply consider the good of their country.

"But what do you think the end will be?" It is easy to foresee this. Supposing things to take their natural course, they must go from bad to worse.

In stipulam veluti cum flamma furentibus austris
Incidit, aut rapidus montano flumine torrens
Exiit, oppositasque evicit gurgite moles.

The people will be inflamed more and more: the torrent will swell higher and higher, till at length it bursts through all opposition, and overflows the land. The consequences of these commotions will be, (unless a higher Hand interpose,) exactly the same as those of the like commotions in the last century. First, The land will become a field of blood: many thousands of poor Englishmen will sheathe their swords in each others bowels, for the diversion of their good neighbours. Then either a commonwealth will ensue, or else a second Cromwell. One must be; but it cannot be determined which, King W——, or King Mob.

"But that case is not parallel with this." It is not, in all particulars. In many respects it is widely different. As, 1st, With regard to the King himself. Few will affirm the character of King Charles, (even allowing the account given by Lord Clarendon, to be punctually true in every respect,) to be as faultless as that of King George. But other passions, as well as love, are blind. So that when these are raised to a proper height, especially when Junius has thrown a little more of his magic dust into the eyes of the people, and convinced them, that what are virtues *in others*, are mere vices *in him*, the good patriots will see no manner of difference, between a King George and King Charles—or even a Nero.

The case is also widely different, 2dly, with regard to the Ministry. King George has no such furious drivers about him, as poor King Charles had. But a skilful painter may easily add a few features, either to one or the other, and by a little colouring make Lord North the very picture of Lord Strafford, and Archbishop Cornwallis of Archbishop Laud.

How different likewise is the case, 3dly, With regard to the *administration* of public affairs? The requiring *tonnage* and *poundage*, the imposing *ship-money*, the prosecutions in the *Bishop's Courts*, in the *High Commission-Court*, and in the *Star-chamber*, were real and intolerable grievances. And what is there in the present administration which bears any resemblance to these? Yet, if you will view even such an affair as the Middlesex Election, through Mr. Horne's magnifying glass, it will appear a more enormous instance of oppression than a hundred star-chambers put together.

The parallel does not hold, 4thly, With regard to the *opposers* of the King and his Ministry. Is Mr. Burke the same calm, wise, disinterested man, that Mr. Hampden was? And where shall we find twenty noblemen and twenty gentlemen (to name no more) in the present opposition, whom any impartial man will set on a level with the same number of those that opposed King Charles and his Ministry.

Nor does the parallel hold, 5thly, In this respect. That was in a great measure a contest about *Religion:* at least about rites and ceremonies, and opinions, which many supposed to be religion. But all religion is out of the question now: this is generally allowed, both by the one side and the other, to be so very a trifle, that they do not give themselves the least concern about it.

In one circumstance more there is an obvious difference. The Parliament were then the King's enemies. Now they are his firmest friends. But indeed this difference may easily be removed. Let the King only take Mr. Wilkes's advice and dissolve the Parliament. The Parliament of

1640, (the first which sat after the troubles began,) although many therein were much dissatisfied with the measures which had been taken, yet would never have been prevailed upon, to join in the schemes which afterwards prevailed. But when that Parliament was so seasonably dissolved, and a few men, wise in their generation, practising with unwearied industry on the heated spirits of the people, had procured a new Parliament to be chosen after their own heart; then it was not long ere the train took fire, and the whole constitution was blown up.

But notwithstanding the disparity between the present and past times, in the preceding repects, yet how surprisingly does the parallel hold in various particulars! 1. A handful of people laid a scheme, which few would have believed, had a man then declared it unto them: (though indeed it is probable, that at the beginning they had no settled scheme at all.) 2. These professed great zeal for the *good of their country*, were vehement contenders for *liberty*, cried aloud against *evil ministers* and the *evil measures* which they pursued, and were continually declaiming against either real or imaginary *grievances*. 3. They were soon joined by men eminent for *probity* as well as for *understanding*, who undoubtedly *were* what the others *appeared*, lovers of their king and country, and desired nothing but the removal of bad ministers, and the redress of real grievances. 4. The spirits even of these were *gradually sharpened* and *embittered* against the king. And they were drawn farther and farther by the art of their leaders, till they had gone so far, they knew not how to retreat: yea, till they had (passively at least) concurred in those measures, which at first their very souls abhorred. 5. Mean time the nation in general was *inflamed* with all possible diligence, by *addresses*, *petitions*, and *remonstrances*, admirably well devised for the purpose; which were the most effectual *libels* that could be imagined against the king and government, and were continually spread throughout the land, with all care and assiduity. 6. Among the most inflamed and embittered in all England were the people of London, as the

managers had the best opportunity of practising upon them.

7. All this time they professed the *highest regard for the king*, for his honour as well as safety; an authentic monument whereof we have in the *solemn League and Covenant.* And these professions they continued with equal vehemence till within a short time of the cutting off his head!

Now what man, who has the least degree of understanding, may not see, in the clearest light, how surprisingly the parallel holds in all these circumstances?

"But do not you think it is in the power of the King to put an end to all these commotions, by only sending his mother away, changing his ministers, and dissolving the parliament?" He may send his mother away; and so he may his wife, if they please to rank her among his evil counsellors. He may put out his present ministers, and desire the Lord Mayor to put others in their place. He may likewise dissolve the present parliament, (as King Charles did that of 1640,) and exchange it for one chosen, animated, and tutored by Mr. Wilkes and his friends. But can you really believe this would *mend* the matter? Would put an end to all these commotions? Certainly the sending his mother to the *Indies* would avail nothing, unless he removed his ministers too. Nor would the putting out these, yea, every man of them, avail any thing, unless at the same time he put in every man whom Lord Chatham chose. But neither would this avail, unless he struck the finishing stroke, by dissolving the parliament. Then indeed he would be as perfectly safe as the "sheep that had given up their dogs?"

It would puzzle the wisest man alive to tell what the King can do: what can he do, that will still the raging of the sea, or the madness of the people? Do you imagine it is in his power to do any thing which will please all parties? Can he do any thing that will not displease one, as much as it will please the other? Shall he drive his * mother

* This was written before the Princess Dowager went abroad.

out of the land? Will this then please all parties? Nay, will not some be apt to inquire, "How has she deserved it at his hands?" Why, she is an evil counsellor. How does this appear? Who are the witnesses of it? Indeed we have read as grave and formal accounts of the conferences at Carleton-house, as if the relater had stood all the time behind the curtain, and taken down the whole matter in short-hand. But what shadow of proof of all this? No more than of the conferences related in Tristram Shandy.

"But she is a bad woman." Who ever said or thought so, even while she was in the flower of her age? From the time that she first set foot in England, was there a more faultless character in the nation? Nay, was not her whole behaviour, as a wife, as a mother, as a mistress, and as a princess, not only blameless, but commendable in the highest degree, till that period of time arrived, when it was judged proper, in order to blacken her (supposed) favourite, to asperse her too? And when she was *illud quod dicere nolo!* One would think that even the *ignobile vulgus, the beasts of the people*, the lowest, basest herd, who wore the human form, would be ashamed of either advancing or crediting so senseless, shameless a tale. Indeed I can hardly think it is credited by one in a hundred even of those who foul their mouths with repeating it. Let it die and be forgotten! Let it not be remembered, that ever any *Englishman* took so dirty a slander into his mouth.

"However, become what will of his mother, let him put away his bad ministers." Suppose they really are bad, do you know where he can find better? Where will he find twenty men, we will not say of *Christian*, but of *Roman* integrity? Point them out, men of sound judgment, of clear apprehension, of universal benevolence, lovers of mankind, lovers of their country, lovers of their King: men attached to no party, but simply pursuing the general good of the nation: not haughty or overbearing: not addicted to passion: not of a revengeful temper: superior to covetousness on the one hand, free from profuseness on the other. I say, shew me the men, only this small num-

ber; or rather, shew them to his Majesty. Let clear and satisfactory proof be given, that this is their character. And if these worthy men are not employed in the place of the unworthy ones, you will then have some reason to stretch your throat against evil ministers.

"But if the matter were wholly left to him, would not Lord ——— immediately employ twenty such?" That may bear some doubt. It is not certain that he would; perhaps he knows not where to find them. And it is not certain to a demonstration, that he would employ them if he did. It is not altogether clear, that he is such himself, that he perfectly answers this character, Is he free from pride? From any thing haughty in his temper, or overbearing in his behaviour? Is he neither passionate nor revengeful? Is it indisputably plain, that he is equally clear of covetousness on the one hand, and profuseness on the other? Is he steady and uniform in his conduct: always one thing? Is he attached to no party, but determined at all events singly to pursue the general good of the nation? Is he a *lover of the King?* Is he *remarkably grateful* to him, from whom he has received no common favours? If not, though he has a strong understanding, and a large share of manly eloquence, still it may be doubted, whether he and his friends would behave a jot better than the ministers we have already.

And suppose the King were to dissolve the parliament, what hope is there of having a better, even though the nation were as quiet and peaceable as it was ten years ago? Are not the present members, generally speaking, men of the greatest property in the land? And are they not, the greater part of them at least, as honest and wise as their neighbours? How then should we mend ourselves at any time; but especially at such a time as this? If a new parliament were chosen during this epidemic madness, what probability of a better than the present? Have we not all the reason in the world to apprehend it would be much worse? That it would be the parliament of 1641, instead of the parliament of 1640? Why, this is the very thing we

want, the very point we are aiming at. Then would Junius and his friends quickly say, "Sir King, know your place!" *Es et ipse lignum.* "Take your choice! Be King log, or to the block!"

Does it not then appear, upon the whole, that it is by no means in the power of the King, by any step which he can possibly take, to put a stop to the present commotions? That especially he cannot make concessions without making a bad matter worse? That the way he has taken, the standing his ground, was as wise a method as he could take, and as likely to restore the peace of the nation, as any the wit of man could devise? If any is more likely, would it not be, vigorously to execute the laws against incendiaries? Against those who, by spreading all manner of lies, inflame the people even to madness: to teach them, that there is a difference between *liberty*, which is the glory of Englishmen, and *licentiousness*, a wanton abuse of liberty, in contempt of all laws, divine and human? Ought they not to *feel*, if they will not *see*, that *scandalum regis*, scandalizing the King, is as punishable as *scandalum magnatum?* That for the future none may dare to slander the King, any more than one of his nobles: much less to print and spread that deadly poison among his Majesty's liege subjects. Is not this little less than high treason? Is it not sowing the seeds of rebellion?

It is possible this might restore peace, but one cannot affirm it would. Perhaps *God has a controversy with the land*, for the general neglect, nay, contempt of all religion. Perhaps he hath said, *Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?* And if this be the case, what can avail, unless his anger be turned away from us? Was there ever a time in which there was a louder call for them that fear God to humble themselves before him? If haply general humiliation and repentance may prevent general destruction!

1788.

THOUGHTS

UPON

LIBERTY.

I scorn to have my free-born toe
Dragoon'd into a wooden shoe.

PRIOR.

1. ALL men in the world desire Liberty; whoever breathes, breathes after this: and that by a kind of natural instinct, antecedent to art or education. Yet at the same time all men of understanding acknowledge it is a rational instinct. For we feel this desire, not in opposition to, but in consequence of our reason. Therefore it is not found, or in a very low degree, in many species of brutes, which seem, even when they are left to their choice, to prefer servitude before liberty.

2. The love of liberty is then the glory of rational beings: and it is the glory of Britons in particular. Perhaps it would be difficult to find any nation under heaven, who are more tenacious of it. Nay, it may be doubted if any nation ever was: not the Spartans, not the Athenians: no, not the Romans themselves, who have been celebrated for this very thing by the poets and historians of all ages.

3. Was it not from this principle, that our British forefathers so violently opposed all foreign invaders? That Julius Cæsar himself, with his victorious legions, could make so little impression upon them? That the generals of the succeeding emperors sustained so many losses from

them? And that, when at length they were overpowered, they rather chose to lose all they had than their liberty; to retire into the Cambrian or Caledonian mountains, where, if they had nothing else, they might at least enjoy their native freedom?

4. Hence arose the vehement struggles of the Cambro-Britons, through so many generations against the yoke, which the Saxons first, and afterwards the English strove to impose upon them: hence the struggles of the English Barons against several of their Kings, lest they should lose the blessing they had received from their forefathers. Yea, the Scottish nobles, as all their histories shew, would no more bear to be enslaved than the Romans. All these, therefore, however differing from each other in a thousand other respects, agreed in testifying the desirableness of liberty, as one of the greatest blessings under the sun.

5. Such was the sense of all our ancestors, even from the earliest ages. And is it not also the general sense of the nation at this day? Who can deny, that the whole kingdom is panting for liberty? Is not the cry for it gone forth, not only through every part of our vast metropolis, from the west end of the city to the east, from the north to the south, so that instead of *no complaining in our streets*, there is nothing but complaining: but likewise into every corner of our land, borne by all the four winds of heaven? Liberty! Liberty! sounds through every county, every city, every town, and every hamlet.

6. Is it not for the sake of this, that the name of our great patriot, (perhaps not so admirable in his private character as *the Man of Ross*, or so great a lover of his country as Codrus, or old Curtius,) is more celebrated than that of any private man has been in England for these thousand years? That his very picture is so joyfully received, in every part of England and Ireland? That we stamp his, (I had almost said, adored,) name, on our handkerchiefs, on the cheerful bowl, yea, and on our vessels of various kinds, as well as upon our hearts? Why is all this, but because of the inseparable connexion between

Wilkes and Liberty? Liberty that came down, if not *fell from heaven;* whom *all England and the world worship?*

7. But, mean time, might it not be advisable to consider, (if we are yet at leisure to consider any thing,) what is Liberty? Because it is well known the word is capable of various senses. And possibly it may not be equally desirable in every sense of the word.

8. There are many nations in America, those particularly that border on Georgia and Carolina, wherein if one disapproves of what another says, or perhaps dislikes his looks, he scorns to affront him to his face, neither does he betray the least dissatisfaction. But as soon as opportunity serves, he steps from behind a tree and shoots him. And none calls him that does it to an account. No: this is the *liberty* he derives from his forefathers.

9. For many ages the free natives of Ireland, as well as those of the Scottish Highlands, when it was convenient for them, made an excursion from their woods or fastnesses, and carried off for their own proper use, the sheep, and oxen, and corn of their neighbours. This was the *liberty* which the O'Neals, the Campbells, and many other septs and clans of venerable antiquity, had received by immemorial tradition from their ancestors.

10. Almost all the soldiers in the Christian world, as well as in the Mahomentan and Pagan, have claimed, more especially in time of war, another kind of *liberty:* that of borrowing the wives and daughters of the men that fell into their hands; sometimes, if they pleaded scruple of conscience or honour, using a little necessary force. Perhaps this may be termed *the liberty of war.* But I will not positively affirm, that it has never been used in this free country, even in the time of peace.

11. In some countries of Europe, and indeed in England, there have been instances of yet another sort of *liberty,* that of calling a monarch to account, and, if need were, taking off his head; that is, if he did not behave in a dutiful manner to our sovereign Lords the People.

12. Now, that we may not always be talking at random, but bring the matter to a determinate point, which of these sorts of liberty do you desire? Is it the first sort? The liberty of knocking on the head, or cutting the throats of those you are out of conceit with? Glorious liberty indeed! What would not king mob do to be gratified with it but for a few weeks? But, I conceive calm, sensible men do not desire to see them entrusted with it. They apprehend there might be some consequences, which, upon the whole, would not redound to the prosperity of the nation.

13. Is the second more desirable? The liberty of taking, when we see best, the goods and chattels of our neighbours? Undoubtedly, thousands in the good city of London, (suppose we made the experiment here first,) would be above measure rejoiced thereat, would leap as broke from chains. O how convenient would it be to have free access, without any let or hinderance, to the cellars, the pantries, the larders, yea, and the coffers of their rich, overgrown landlords! But perhaps it would not give altogether so much joy to the Lord Mayor or Aldermen: no, nor even to those staunch friends of liberty, the Common Councilmen. Not that they regard their own interest at all: but, setting themselves out of the question, they are a little in doubt whether this liberty would be for the good of trade.

14. Is it then the third kind of liberty we contend for; the liberty of taking our neighbours, wives, and daughters? Ye pretty gentlemen, ye beaux esprits, will ye not, one and all, give your voices for this natural liberty? Will ye not say, "If we cry out against monopolies of other kinds, shall we tolerate the monopoly of women?" But hold. Are there not some among *you* too, who have wives if not daughters, of your own? And are you altogether willing to oblige the first comer with them? I say, the first comer: for observe! As you are to give the liberty you take, so you must not pick and choose your men: you know, by nature, all men are on a level. Liberty! Li-

berty! No restraint! We are free-born Englishmen: down with the fences! Lay all the inclosures open! No: it will not do. Even nature recoils. We are not yet *polished* enough for this.

15. Are we not ripe, however, for the fourth kind of liberty, that of removing a disobedient King? Would Mr. Wilkes, would Mr. Horne, would any *free Briton* have any objection to this? Provided only, that as soon as our present Monarch is removed, we have a better to put in his place. But who is he? King John? That will not sound well even in the ears of his greatest admirers. And whoever calmly considers the characters and endowments of those other great men, who may think themselves much fitter for the office than his present Majesty, will hardly concur in their opinion; so that a difficulty lies in your way. Whatever claim you may have to this liberty, you must not use it yet, because you cannot tell where to find a better Prince.

16. But to speak seriously. These things being set aside, which the bawling mob dignify by that name; what is that *liberty*, properly so called, which every wise and good man desires? It is either *religious* or *civil*. Religious liberty is, a liberty to choose our own religion, to worship God according to our own conscience, according to the best light we have. Every man living, as man, has a right to this, as he is a rational creature. The Creator gave him this right when he endowed him with understanding. And every man must judge for himself, because every man must give an account of himself to God. Consequently this is an indefesible right; it is inseparable from humanity. And God did never give authority to any man, or number of men, to deprive any child of man thereof, under any colour or pretence whatever. What an amazing thing is it then, that the governing part of almost every nation under heaven should have taken upon them in all ages to rob all under their power of this liberty? Yea, should take upon them at this day so to do! To force rational creatures, into their own religion! Would one think it possible, that the most sensible men in the world

should say to their fellow creatures, "Either be of my religion or I will take away your food, and you, and your wife, and your children shall starve? If that will not convince you, I will fetter your hands and feet, and throw you into a dungeon. And if still you will not *see as I see*, I will burn you alive."

17. It would not be altogether so astonishing, if this were the manner of American savages. But what shall we say, if numberless instances of it have occurred, in the politest nations of Europe? Have no instances of the kind been seen in Britain? Have not England and Scotland seen the horrid fires? Have not the flames, burning the flesh of Heretics, shone in London as well as in Paris and Lisbon? Have we forgot the days of *good* Queen Mary? No: they will be had in everlasting remembrance. And although burning was out of fashion in Queen Elizabeth's days, yet hanging even for religion was not. It is true, her successor did not go quite so far. But did even King James allow liberty of conscience? By no means. During his whole reign, what liberty had the Puritans? What liberty had they in the following reign? If they were not persecuted unto death; (although eventually indeed many of them were, for they died in their imprisonment,) yet were they not continually harassed, by prosecutions in the Bishop's-courts or Star-chamber? By fines upon fines, frequently reducing them to the deepest poverty? And by imprisonment for months, yea for years together, till many of them, escaping with the skin of their teeth, left their country and friends, fled to seek their bread in the wilds of America? However, we may suppose, all this was at an end under the merry monarch, King Charles II. Was it indeed? Where have they lived who suppose this? To wave a thousand particular instances: what will you say to those two public monuments, the Act of Uniformity, and the Act against Conventicles? In the former it is enacted, to the eternal honour of the King, Lords, and Commons, at that memorable period, "Every parson, vicar, or other minister whatever, who has any benefice within these

realms, shall, before the next twenty-fourth of August, openly and publickly declare, his unfeigned assent and consent, to all and every thing contained in the book of Common Prayer, or shall *ipso facto* be deprived of all his benefices! Likewise, if any dean, prebendary, master, fellow, chaplain, or tutor, of any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, any public professor, any other person in holy orders, any schoolmaster, or teacher, or tutor in any private family, do not subscribe hereto he shall be *ipso facto* deprived of his place, and shall be utterly disabled from continuing therein."

Property for ever! See how well *English property* was secured in those golden days!

So, by this glorious act, thousands of men, guilty of no crime, nothing contrary either to justice, mercy, or truth, were stripped of all they had, of their houses, lands, revenues, and driven to seek where they could, or beg their bread. For what? Because they did not dare to worship God according to other men's consciences! So they and their families were at one stroke turned out of house and home, and reduced to little less than beggary, for no other fault, real or pretended; but because they could not assent and consent to that manner of worship, which their worthy governors prescribed!

But this was not all. It was further enacted by the same merciful lawgivers, "If any person act as a teacher, tutor, or school-master, in any private family, before he has subscribed hereto, he shall suffer three months imprisonment, without bail or mainprize."

Liberty for ever! Here is security for your person, as well as your property!

By virtue of the Act against Conventicles, if any continued to worship God according to their own consciences, they were first robbed of their substance, and, if they persisted, of their liberty; often of their lives also. For this crime, under this *our most religious and gracious King!* (What were they who publickly told God he was such!) Englishmen were not only spoiled of their goods, but de-

nied even the use of the free air, yea and the light of the sun, being thrust by hundreds into dark and loathsome prisons!

18. Were matters much better in the neighbouring kingdom? Nay, they were inexpressibly worse. Unheard of cruelties were practised there, from soon after the restoration till the revolution.* What fining, plundering, beating, maiming, imprisoning, with the most shocking circumstances? For a specimen, look at Dunotter castle! where young and old, of both sexes, (sick or well, it was all one,) were thrust together between bare walls, and that in the heat of summer, without a possibility of either lying or sitting; yea without any convenience of any kind, till many of them, through hunger, thirst, heat, and stench, were set at liberty by death! Considering this; considering how many others were hunted over their native mountains, and shot whenever they were overtaken, with no more ceremony than beasts: considering the drowning, hanging, cutting off of limbs, and various arts of torturing, which were practised by order of King Charles, and often in the presence of King James, who seemed to enjoy such spectacles; it would be no wonder if the very name of an Englishman was had in abomination from the Tweed to the Orkneys.

19. But is this the case at present with *Us*? Are we abridged of our religious liberty? His late Majesty was desired, about thirty years ago, to take a step of this kind. But his answer was worthy of a king, yea the king of a free people, "I tell you, while I sit on the English throne, no man shall be persecuted for conscience' sake." And it is certain, he made his promise good from the beginning of his reign to the end. But perhaps the case is altered now. Does his present Majesty tread in his steps? He does, he persecutes no man for conscience' sake. If he does, where is the man? I do not ask, whom has he committed to the

* See Wodrow's History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland.

flames, or caused to die by the commmon hangman; or whom has he caused to die many deaths, by hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness: but whom has he tortured or thrust into a dungeon, yea, or imprisoned at all, or fined, for worshipping God according to his own conscience, in the Presbyterian, or any other way? O compare King Charles, gracious Charles II. with King George. And you will know the value of the liberty you enjoy.

20. In the name of wonder, what religious liberty can you desire, or even conceive, which you have not already? Where is there a nation in Europe, in the habitable world, which enjoys such liberty of conscience as the English? I will be bold to say, there is nothing like it in Holland, in Germany, (Protestant or Popish,) in either the Protestant or Popish cantons of Switzerland; no, nor in any country under the sun. Have we not in England full liberty to choose any religion, yea, or no religion at all? To have no more religion than a Hottentot, shall I say? Nay, no more than a bull or a swine? Whoever, therefore, in England stretches his throat, and bawls for more religious liberty, must be totally void of shame, and can have no excuse but want of understanding.

21. But is not the ground of this vehement outcry, that we are deprived of our civil liberty? What is *civil liberty?* A liberty to enjoy our lives and fortunes in our own way: to use our property, whatever is legally our own, according to our own choice. And can you affirm, "That we are robbed of this liberty? Who are? Certainly I am not. I pray, do not face me down that I am. Do not argue me out of my senses. If the Great Turk, or the King of France, wills that a man should die, with or without cause, die he must. And instances of the kind continually occur: but no such instances occur in England. I am in no more danger of death from King George, than from the Queen of Hungary. And if I study to be quiet and mind my own business, I am in no more danger of losing my liberty than my life. No, nor my property; I mean by any act of

the King. If this is in any degree invaded, it is not by the King, or his parliament, or army; but by the good patriots.

Hark! Is hell or Bedlam broken loose? What roaring is that, loud as the waves of the sea? "It is the patriot mob." What do they want with me? Why do they flock about my house? "Make haste! Illuminate your windows, in honour of Mr. Wilkes." I cannot in conscience; I think it is encouraging vice. "Then they will all be broken." That is, in plain English, give them twenty shillings, or they will rob you of five pounds. Here are champions for the laws of the land! For liberty and property! O vile horse-guards!

"That dared, so grim and terrible to' advance
"Their miscreated fronts athwart the way!"

True, they did nothing, and said nothing. Yet (in default of the civil powers, who did not concern themselves with the matter,) they hindered the mob from finishing their work.

22. Why then these men, instead of any way abridging it, plainly preserved my liberty and property. And by their benefit, not the care of those to whom it properly belonged, I still enjoy full, civil liberty. I am free to live in every respect, according to my own choice. My life, my person, my property, are safe. I am not murdered, maimed, tortured, at any man's pleasure: I am not thrown into prison. I am not manacled: see, I have not one fetter, either on my hands or feet. And are not you as free as I am? Are you not at liberty to enjoy the fruit of your labours? Who hinders you from doing it? Does King George? Does Lord North? Do any of his Majesty's officers or soldiers? No, nor any man living. Perhaps some would hinder you, if you acted contrary to law: but this is not liberty; it is licentiousness. Deny the fact who can: am not I free to use my substance according to my own discretion? And do not you enjoy the self-same freedom? You cannot, you dare not deny it. At this hour I am at full liberty, to use my property as I please. And so are

you: you do, in fact, use your house, your goods, your land, as is right in your own eyes. Does any one take them from you? No; nor does any one restrain you from the full enjoyment of them. What then is the matter? What is it you are making all this pother about? Why are you thus wringing your hands, and screaming, to the terror of your quiet neighbours, "Destruction! Slavery! Bondage! Help, countrymen! Our liberty is destroyed! We are ruined, chained, fettered, undone!" Fettered! How? Where are the fetters, but in your own imagination? There are none, either on your hands, or mine. Neither you nor I can shew to any man in his senses, that we have one chain upon us, even so big as a knitting-needle.

23. I do not say, that the ministry are without fault; or that they have *done all things well.* But still I ask, What is the liberty which we want? It is not civil or religious liberty. These we have in such a degree as was never known before, not from the times of William the Conqueror.† But all this is nothing: this will never satisfy the *bellua multorum capitum.* That many-headed beast, the people, roars for liberty of another kind. Many want *Indian liberty*, the liberty of cutting throats, or of driving a brace of balls through the head of those ugly-looking fellows, whom they cannot abide the sight of. Many more want the old *Highland liberty*, the convenient liberty of plundering. Many others there are, who want the *liberty of war*, of borrowing their neighbour's wives or daughters. And not a few (though they do not always avow it) the liberty of murdering their prince.

24. If you are a reasonable man, a man of real honour, and consequently want none of these, I beg to know, What would you have? Consider the thing calmly. What liberty can you reasonably desire, which you do not already enjoy? What is the matter with you; and with multitudes of the

† If the famous *Middlesex* election was an exception to this; yet observe, one swallow makes no summer.

good people, both in England and Ireland? That they are crying and groaning as if they were chained to an oar, or barred up in the dungeons of the Inquisition! The plain, melancholy truth is this: there is a general infatuation, which spreads, like an overflowing stream, from one end of the land to the other. And a man must have great wisdom and strength, or he will be carried away by the torrent. But how can we account for this epidemic madness? For it deserves no better name. We must not dare to give the least intimation, that the devil has any thing to do with it. No, this *enlightened* age is too wise to believe that there is any devil in being. Satan, avaunt! We have driven thee back into the land of shadows, keep thou among thy own kindred:

"With hydras, gorgons, and chimeras dire."

Suppose it then to be a purely natural phenomenon: I ask again, how can we account for it? I apprehend, if we could divest ourselves of prejudice, it might be done very easily; and that without concerning ourselves with the hidden springs of action, the motives or intentions of men. Letting these alone, is there not a visible, undeniable cause, which is quite adequate to the effect? The good people of England have for some years past, been continually fed with poison. Dose after dose has been administered to them, for fear the first, or second, or tenth, should not suffice, of a poison whose natural effect is, to drive men out of their senses. "Is the *centaur* not fabulous?" Neither is *Circe's cup*. See how, in every county, city, and village, it is now turning quiet, reasonable men, into wild bulls, bears, and tigers! But to lay metaphor aside, how long have the *public papers* represented one of the best of princes as if he had been one of the worst, as little better than Caligula, Nero, or Domitian? These were followed by *pamphlets* of the same kind, and aiming at the same point, to make the King appear odious as well as contemptible, in the eyes of his subjects. Letters succeed, written in fine language, and with exquisite art: but filled with the gall of bitterness. "Yes, but not against the King; Junius does not

strike at him, but at the evil Administration." Thin pretence! Does not every one see the blow is aimed at the King through the sides of his ministers? All these are conveyed, week after week, through all London and all the nation. Can any man wonder at the effect of this? What can be more natural? What can be expected, but that they who drink in these papers and letters with all greediness, will be thoroughly embittered and inflamed thereby? Will first despise and then abhor the King? What can we expect, but that by the repeated doses of this poison they will be perfectly intoxicated, and only wait for a convenient season to tear in pieces the Royal Monster (as they think him) and all his adherents?

25. At present there are hinderances in the way, so that they cannot use their teeth as they would. One is, an untoward Parliament, who *will not* look upon the King with the same eye that they do; but still think he has no more design or desire to enslave the nation, than to burn the city of London. A still greater hinderance is the army: even lions and bears do not choose to encounter them, so that these men of war do really at this time preserve the peace of the nation. What then can be done before the people cools, that this precious opportunity be not lost? What indeed, but to prevail upon the King to dissolve his Parliament and disband his army? Nay, let the Parliament stay as it is; it will suffice to disband the army. If these redcoats were but out of the way, the mob would soon deal with the Parliament. *Probatum est:* nothing is more easy than to keep *malignant members* from the house. Remember Lord North not long ago: * this was a taste, a specimen of their activity. What then would they not do if they were masters of the field, if none were left to oppose them? Would not the avenues of both Houses be so well guarded, that none but Patriots would dare to approach?

26. But (as often as you have heard the contrary affirmed)

* Rudely insulted by a turbulent mob, as he was going into the House.

King George has too much understanding, to throw himself into the hands of those men who have given full proof that they bear him no great good will. Nor has he reason to believe that they are much more fond of his office than of his person. They are not vehemently fond of monarchy itself, whoever the monarch be. T herefore, neither their good nor ill words will induce him, in haste, to leap into the fire with his eyes open.

27. But can any thing be done to open the eyes, to restore the senses, of an infatuated nation? Not unless the still-renewed, still operating cause of that infatuation can be removed. But how is it possible to be removed, unless by restraining the licentiousness of the press? And is not this remedy worse than the disease? Let us weigh this matter a little. There was an ancient law in Scotland, which made *leasing-making* a capital crime. By leasing-making was meant, telling such *wilful lies*, as tended to breed dissension between the King and his subjects. What pity but there should be such a law enacted in the present Session of Parliament? By our present laws a man is punishable for publishing even truth, to the detriment of his neighbour. This I would not wish. But should he not be punished, who publishes palpable lies? And such lies as manifestly tend to breed dissension between the King and his subjects? Such, with a thousand more, was that barefaced lie of the King's *bursting out into laughter* before the city magistrates! Now does not the publisher of this lie deserve to lose his ears more than a common knight of the post? And if he is liable to no punishment for a crime of so mischievous a nature, what a grievous defect is in our law! And how loud does it call for a reme

28. To return to the point whence we set out. You see whence arose this outcry for liberty, andthese dismal complaints, that we are robbed of our liberty, echoing through the land. It is plain to every unprejudiced man, they have not the least foundation. We enjoy at this day throughout these kingdoms such liberty, civil and religious, as no other kingdom or commonwealth in Europe, or in the world,

enjoys: and such as our ancestors never enjoyed from the conquest to the revolution. Let us be thankful for it to God and the King! Let us not by our vile unthankfulness, yea, our denial that we enjoy it at all, provoke the King of kings to take it away. By one stroke, by taking to himself that Prince whom we know not how to value, He might change the scene, and put an end to our civil as well as religious liberty. Then would be seen who were patriots, and who were not; who were real lovers of liberty and their country. The God of love remove that day far from us! Deal not with us according to our deservings; but let us know, at least in this our day, the things which make for our peace!

February 24, 1772.

THOUGHTS

CONCERNING

THE ORIGIN OF POWER.

1. BY *Power*, I here mean, *supreme power*, the power over life and death, and consequently over our liberty and property, and all things of an inferior nature.

2. In many nations this power has, in all ages, been lodged in a single person. This has been the case in almost the whole eastern world, from the earliest antiquity: as in the celebrated empires of Assyria, of Babylon, of Media, Persia, and many others. And so it remains to this day, from Constantinople to the farthest India. The same form of government obtained very early, in very many parts of Afric, and remains in most of them still, as well as in the empires of Morocco and Abyssinia. The first adventurers to America found absolute *monarchy* established there also: the whole power being lodged in the Emperor of Mexico, and the Yncas of Peru. Nay, and many of the ancient nations of Europe were governed by single persons; as Spain, France, the Russias, and several other nations are at this day.

3. But in others, the power has been lodged in a few, chiefly the rich and noble. This kind of government, usually styled *aristocracy*, obtained in Greece, and in Rome, after many struggles with the people, during the later ages of the republic. And this is the government which, at present, subsists in various parts of Europe. In Venice indeed,

as well as in Genoa, the supreme power is nominally lodged in one, namely, the Doge: but in fact, he is only a royal shade: it is really lodged in a few of the nobles.

4. Where the people have the supreme power, it is termed a *democracy*. This seems to have been the ancient form of government in several of the Grecian states. And so it was at Rome, for some ages after the expulsion of the kings. From the earliest authentic records, there is reason to believe it was for espousing the cause of the people, and defending their rights against the illegal encroachments of the nobles, that Marcus Coriolanus was driven into banishment, and Manlius Capitolinus, as well as Tiberius and Caius Gracchus, were murdered. Perhaps formerly the popular government subsisted in several states. But it is scarcely now to be found, being every where swallowed up either in monarchy or aristocracy.

5. But the grand question is, not in whom this power is lodged, but from whom it is ultimately derived. What is the origin of power? What is its primary source? This has been long a subject of debate. And it has been debated with the utmost warmth, by a variety of disputants. But as earnest as they have been on each side of the question, they have seldom come to any good conclusion: but have left the point undecided still, to be a ball of contention to the next generation.

6. But is it impossible, in the nature of things, to throw any light on this obscure subject? Let us make the experiment: let us (without pretending to *dictate*, but desiring every one to use his own judgment) try to find out some ground whereon to stand, and go as far as we can toward answering the question. And let not any man be angry on the account, suppose we should not exactly agree. Let every one enjoy his own opinion, and give others the same liberty.

7. Now I cannot but acknowledge, I believe an old book, commonly called the bible, to be true. Therefore I believe, *there is no power but from God*, Rom. xiii. 1. *The powers that be, are ordained of God.* There is no *subordi-*

nate power in any nation, but what is derived from the supreme power therein. So in England the King, in the United Provinces the States are the fountain of all power. And there is no *supreme power*, no power of the sword, of life and death, but what is derived from God, the Sovereign of all.

8. But have not *the people*, in every age and nation, the right of disposing of this power? Of investing therewith whom they please, either one or more persons; and that in what proportion they see good, and upon what conditions? Consequently, if those conditions are not observed, have they not a *right* to take away the power they gave? And does not this imply, that they are the judges whether those conditions are observed or not? Otherwise, if the receivers were judges of their own cause, this right would fall into nothing.

9. To prove this, that *the people*, in every country are the source of power, it is argued thus: "All men living upon earth are naturally equal; none is above another. And all are naturally free, masters of their own actions. It manifestly follows, no man can have any power over another, unless by his own consent. The power therefore which the governors in any nation enjoy, must be originally derived from *the people*, and presupposes an *original compact* between them and their first governors."

10. This seems to be the opinion which is now generally espoused by men of understanding and education: and that (if I do not mistake) not in England alone, but almost in every civilized nation. And it is usually espoused with the fullest and strongest persuasion, as a truth little less than self-evident; as what is clear beyond all possibility of doubt, what commands the assent of all reasonable men. Hence if any man affected to deny it, he would in most companies be rather hooted at than argued with: it being so absurd to oppose what is confirmed by the general suffrage of mankind.

11. But still (suppose it to need no proof) it may need a little explaining. For every one does not understand the

term. Some will ask, Who are *the people?* Are they *every man, woman, and child?* Why not? Is it not allowed, is it not affirmed, is it not our fundamental principle, our incontestable, self-evident axiom, that "all persons living upon earth are naturally equal? That all human creatures are naturally free? Masters of their own actions? That none can have any power over others, but by their own consent?" Why then should not every man, woman, and child, have a voice in placing their governors? In fixing the measure of power to be intrusted with them, and the conditions on which it is intrusted? And why should not every one have a voice in displacing them too? Seeing it is undeniable, they that gave the power have a right to take it away. Do not quibble or shuffle. Do not evade the question; but come close to the point. I ask, by what argument do you prove, that women are not naturally as free as men? And if they are, why have they not as good a right as we have to choose their own governors? Who can have any power over free, rational creatures, but by their own consent? And are they not free by nature as well as we? Are they not rational creatures?

12. But suppose we exclude women from using their natural right, by might overcoming right, by main strength; (for it is sure, that we are stronger than they: I mean that we have stronger limbs, if we have not stronger reason) what pretence have we for excluding men like ourselves, yea, thousands and tens of thousands, barely because they have not lived one and twenty years? "Why, they have not wisdom or experience to judge concerning the qualifications necessary for governors?" I answer, 1. Who has? How many of the voters in Great Britain? One in twenty? One in a hundred? If you exclude all who have not this wisdom, you will leave few behind. But, 2. Wisdom and experience are nothing to the purpose. You have put the matter upon another issue. Are they men? That is enough. Are they human creatures? Then they have a right to choose their own governors: an indefesible right:

a right inherent, inseparable from human nature. "But in England, at least, they are excluded by law." But did they consent to the making of that law? If not, by your original supposition, it can have no power over them. I therefore utterly deny, that we can, consistently with that supposition, debar either women or minors from choosing their own governors.

13. But suppose we exclude these by main force, (which it is certain we are able to do, since though they have most votes they have least strength) are all that remain, all *men of full age*, the people? Are all males then, that have lived one and twenty years, allowed to choose their own governors? "Not at all: not in England, unless they are freeholders, unless they have forty shillings a year." Worse and worse. After depriving half of the human species of their natural right for want of a beard; after depriving myriads more for want of a stiff beard, for not having lived one and twenty years; you rob others (probably some hundreds of thousands) of their birth-right for want of money! Yet not altogether on this account neither: if so, it might be more tolerable. But here is an Englishman, who has money enough to buy the estates of fifty freeholders, and yet he must not be numbered among *the people*, because he has not two or three acres of land! How is this? By what right do you exclude a man from being one of the people, because he has not forty shillings a year? Yea, or not a groat? Is he not a man, whether he be rich or poor? Has he not a soul and a body? Has he not the nature of a man? Consequently all the rights of a man, all that flow from human nature? And among the rest, that of not being controlled by any, but by his own consent?

14. "But he is excluded by law." By what law? By a law of his own making? Did he consent to the making of it? Before this law was passed, was his consent either obtained or asked? If not, what is that law to him? No man, you aver, has any power over another, but by his own consent. Of consequence, a law made without his consent,

is with regard to him null and void. You cannot say otherwise, without destroying the supposition, that none can be governed but by his own consent.

15. See now, to what your argument comes. You affirm, all power is derived from *the people*: and presently exclude one half of the people, from having any part or lot in the matter. At another stroke, suppose England to contain eight millions of people, you exclude one or two millions more. At a third, suppose two millions left, you exclude three fourths of these. And the poor pittance that remains, by I know not what figure of speech, you call, *The people of England!*

16. Hitherto we have endeavoured to view this point in the mere light of reason. And even by this means it manifestly appears, that this supposition, which is so high in vogue, which is so generally received, nay, which has been palmed upon us with such confidence, as undeniable and self-evident, is not only false, not only contrary to reason, but contradictory to itself: the very men who are most positive, that the people are the source of power, being brought into an inextricable difficulty, by that single question, "Who are the people?" Reduced to a necessity of either giving up the point, or owning that by *the people* they mean scarcely a tenth part of them.

17. But we need not rest the matter entirely on reasoning; let us appeal to matter of fact. And because we cannot have so clear and certain a prospect of what is at too great a distance, whether of time or place, let us only take a view of what has been in our own country, for six or seven hundred years. I ask then, when and where did *the people* of England (even suppose by that word, *the people*, you mean only a hundred thousand of them) choose their own governors? Did they choose, to go no farther, William the Conqueror? Did they choose King Stephen or King John? As to those who regularly succeeded their fathers, it is plain, *the people* are out of the question. Did they choose Henry IV.? Edward IV. or Henry VII.? Who will be so hardy as to affirm it? Did the *people* of Eng-

land, or but fifty thousand of them, choose Queen Mary, or Queen Elizabeth? To come nearer to our own times, did they choose King James I.? Perhaps you will say, "But if the people did not *give* King Charles the supreme power, at least they took it away from him. Surely you will not deny this." Indeed I will: I deny it utterly. The *people of England* no more took away his power, than they cut off his head. "Yes, the parliament did, and they are the people." No: the parliament did not. The lower house, the House of Commons, is not *the parliament*, any more than it is the nation. Neither were those who then sat, the House of Commons: no, nor one quarter of them. But suppose they had been the whole House of Commons, yea, or the whole parliament; by what rule of logic will you prove, that seven or eight hundred persons are *the people* of England? "Why, they are the delegates of the people; they are chosen by them." No, not by one half, not by a quarter, not by a tenth part of them. So that *the people*, in the only proper sense of the word, were innocent of the whole affair.

18. "But you will allow, *the people* gave the supreme power to King Charles II. at the restoration." I will allow no such thing; unless by *the people* you mean General Monck and fifteen thousand soldiers. "However, you will not deny, that *the people* gave the power to King William at the revolution." Nay, truly, I must deny this too. I cannot possibly allow it. Although I will not say, that William III. obtained the royal power as William I. did: although he did not claim it by right of conquest, which would have been an odious title: yet certain it is, that he did not receive it by any act or deed of *the people*. Their consent was neither obtained nor asked: they were never consulted in the matter. It was not therefore *the people* that gave him the power: no, nor even the parliament. It was the *convention*, and none else. "Who were the *convention?*" They were a few hundreds of lords and gentlemen, who, observing the desperate state of public affairs, met together on that important occasion. So that

still we have no single instance in above seven hundred years, of *the people* of England's conveying the supreme power, either to one or more persons.

19. Indeed I remember in all history, both ancient and modern, but one instance of supreme power conferred by *the people;* if we mean thereby, though not all the people, yet a great majority of them. This celebrated instance occurred at Naples, in the middle of the last century; where *the people*, properly speaking, that is men, women, and children, claimed and exerted their natural right in favour of Thomas Aniello, (vulgarly called Masanello,) a young fisherman. But will any one say, he was the only governor for these thousand years, who has had a proper right to the supreme power? I believe not: nor, I apprehend, does any one desire, that *the people* should take the same steps in London.

20. So much both for reason and matter of fact. But one single consideration, if we dwell a little upon it, will bring the question to a short issue. It is allowed no man can dispose of another's life but by his own consent. I add, no, nor with his consent. For no man has a right to dispose of his own life. The Creator of man has the sole right to take the life which he gave. Now it is an indisputable truth, *Nihil dat quod non habet:* none gives what he has not. It plainly follows, that no man can give to another a right which he never had himself: a right which only the Governor of the world has; even the wiser Heathens being judges: but which no man upon the face of the earth either has or can have. No man therefore can give the power of the sword, any such power as implies a right to take away life. Wherever it is, it must descend from God alone, the sole Disposer of life and death.

21. The supposition then, that *the people* are the origin of power, is every way indefensible. It is absolutely overturned by the very principle on which it is supposed to stand, namely, that a right of choosing his governors belongs to every partaker of human nature. If this be so, then it belongs to every individual of the human species:

consequently, not to freeholders alone, but to all men; not to men only, but to women also: nor only to adult men and women, to those who have lived one and twenty years, but to those who have lived eighteen or twenty, as well as those who have lived three-score. But none did ever maintain this, nor probably ever will. Therefore this boasted principle falls to the ground, and the whole superstructure with it. So common sense brings us back to the grand truth, *There is no power but of God.*

A

CALM ADDRESS

TO

Our American Colonies.

Ne, pueri, ne tanta animis assuescite bella,
Neu patriæ validas in viscera vertite vires.

VIRGIL.

BRETHREN, AND COUNTRYMEN,

1. THE grand Question which is now debated, (and with warmth enough on both sides,) is this, Has the English Parliament power to tax the American Colonies?

In order to determine this, let us consider the nature of our Colonies. An English Colony is, a number of persons to whom the King grants a charter, permitting them to settle in some far country as a corporation, enjoying such powers as the charter grants, to be administered in such a manner as the charter prescribes. As a corporation they make laws for themselves: but as a corporation subsisting by a grant from higher authority, to the control of that authority they still continue subject.

Considering this, nothing can be more plain, than that the supreme power in England has a legal right of laying any tax upon them for any end beneficial to the whole empire.

2. But you object, "It is the privilege of a freeman and "an Englishman to be taxed only by his own consent.

"And this consent is given for every man by his repre-
"sentative in parliament. But we have no representation
"in Parliament. Therefore we ought not to be taxed
"thereby."

I answer, This argument proves too much. If the Parliament cannot tax you, because you have no representation therein, for the same reason it can make no laws to bind you. If a freeman cannot be taxed without his own consent, neither can he be punished without it: for whatever holds with regard to taxation, holds with regard to all other laws. Therefore he who denies the English Parliament the power of taxation, denies it the right of making any laws at all. But this power over the Colonies you have never disputed: you have always admitted statutes, for the punishment of offences, and for the preventing or redressing of inconveniences. And the reception of any law draws after it by a chain which cannot be broken, the necessity of admitting taxation.

3. But I object to the very foundation of your plea. That "every freeman is governed by laws to which he has "consented," as confidently as it has been asserted, it is absolutely false. In wide-extended dominions, a very small part of the people are concerned in making laws. This, as all public business, must be done by delegation, the delegates are chosen by a select number. And those that are not electors, who are far the greater part, stand by, idle and helpless spectators.

The case of electors is little better. When they are near equally divided, almost half of them must be governed not only without, but even against their own consent.

And how has any man consented to those laws, which were made before he was born? Our consent to these, nay, and to the laws now made even in England, is purely passive. And in every place, as all men are born the subjects of some state or other, so they are born, passively, as it were consenting to the laws of that state. Any other than this kind of consent, the condition of civil life does not allow.

"4. But you say, You "are intitled to life, liberty, "and property by nature; and that you have never ceded "to any sovereign power, the right to dispose of these "without your consent."

While you speak as the naked sons of nature, this is certainly true. But you presently declare, "Our ancestors "at the time they settled these Colonies, were intitled to "all the rights of natural-born subjects, within the realm "of England." This likewise is true; but when this is granted, the boast of original rights is at an end. You are no longer in a state of nature, but sink down to Colonists, governed by a charter. If your ancestors were subjects, they acknowledged a Sovereign: if they had a right to English privileges, they were accountable to English laws, and had *ceded* to the King and Parliament, *the power of disposing without their consent*, of both *their lives, liberties, and properties.* And did the Parliament cede to them, a dispensation from the obedience which they owe as natural subjects? Or any degree of independence, nor enjoyed by other Englishmen?"

5. "They did not," indeed, as you observe, "by emi-"gration forfeit any of those privileges: but they were, "and their descendants now are entitled to all such as their "circumstances enable them to enjoy."

That they who form a Colony by a lawful charter, forfeit no privilege thereby, is certain. But what they do not forfeit by any judicial sentence, they may lose by natural effects. When a man voluntary comes into America, he may lose what he had when in Europe. Perhaps he had a right to vote for a knight or burgess: by crossing the sea he did not *forfeit* this right. But it is plain he has made the exercise of it no longer possible. He has reduced himself from a voter to one of the innumerable multitude that have no votes.

6. But you say, "As the Colonies are not represented "in the British Parliament, they are entitled to a free "power of legislation. For they inherit all the right which

"their ancestors had of enjoying all the privileges of Eng-
"lishmen."

They do inherit all the privileges which their ancestors had: but they can inherit no more. Their ancestors left a country where the representatives of the people were elected by men particularly qualified, and where those who wanted that qualification were bound by the decisions of men whom they had not deputed. You are the descendants of men who either had no votes, or resigned them by emigration. You have therefore exactly what your ancestors left you: not a vote in making laws, nor in choosing legislators, but the happiness of being protected by laws, and the duty of obeying them.

What your ancestors did not bring with them, neither they nor their descendants have acquired. They have not, by abandoning their right in one legislature, acquired a right to constitute another: any more than the multitudes in England who have no vote, have a right to erect a Parliament for themselves.

7. However the "Colonies have a right to all the privi-
"leges granted them by royal charters, or secured to them
"by provincial laws."

The first clause is allowed: they have certainly a right to all the privileges granted them by royal charters. But as to the second there is a doubt: provincial laws may grant privileges to individuals of the province. But surely no province can confer provincial privileges on itself! They have a right to all which the King has given them; but not to all which they have given themselves.

A corporation can no more assume to itself privileges which it had not before, than a man can, by his own act and deed, assume titles or dignities. The legislature of a colony may be compared to the vestry of a large parish: which may lay a cess on its inhabitants, but still regulated by the law: and which, whatever be its internal expenses, is still liable to taxes laid by superior authority.

The charter of Pennsylvania has a clause admitting, in-

express terms, taxation by parliament. If such a clause be not inserted in other charters, it must be omitted as not necessary; because it is manifestly implied in the very nature of subordinate government: all countries which are subject to laws, being liable to taxes.

It is true, the first settlers in Massachusetts-Bay were promised *an exemption from taxes for seven years.* But does not this very exemption imply, that they were to pay them afterwards?

If there is in the charter of any Colony a clause exempting them from taxes for ever, then undoubtedly they have a right to be so exempted. But if there is no such clause, then the English Parliament has the same right to tax them as to tax any other English subjects.

8. All that impartially consider what has been observed, must readily allow, that the English Parliament has undoubted right to tax all the English Colonies.

But whence then is all this hurry and tumult? Why is America all in an uproar? If you can yet give yourselves time to think, you will see, the plain case is this.

A few years ago, you were assaulted by enemies, whom you were not well able to resist. You represented this to your mother-country, and desired her assistance. You were largely assisted, and by that means wholly delivered from all your enemies.

After a time, your mother-country desiring to be reimbursed for some part of the large expense she had been at, laid a small tax, (which she had always a right to do,) on one of her Colonies.

But how is it possible, that the taking this reasonable and legal step, should have set all America in a flame?

I will tell you my opinion freely; and perhaps you will not think it improbable. I speak the more freely, because I am unbiassed: I have nothing to hope or fear from either side. I gain nothing either by the Government or by the Americans, and probably never shall. And I have no prejudice to any man in America: I love you as my brethren and countrymen.

9. My opinion is this. We have a few men in England, who are determined enemies to monarchy. Whether they hate his present Majesty on any other ground, than because he is a King, I know not. But they cordially hate his office, and have for some years been undermining it with all diligence, in hopes of erecting their grand idol, their dear commonwealth, upon its ruins. I believe they have let very few into their design: (although many forward it, without knowing any thing of the matter;) but they are steadily pursuing it, as by various other means, so in particular by inflammatory papers, which are industriously and continually dispersed, throughout the town and country: by this method they have already wrought thousands of the people, even to the pitch of madness. By the same, only varied according to your circumstances, they have likewise inflamed America. I make no doubt, but these very men are the original cause of the present breach between England and her Colonies. And they are still pouring oil into the flame, studiously incensing each against the other, and opposing under a variety of pretences, all measures of accommodation. So that although the Americans, in general, love the English, and the English, in general, love the Americans, (all I mean that are not yet cheated and exasperated by these artful men,) yet the rupture is growing wider every day, and none can tell where it will end.

These good men hope it will end in the total defection of North America from England. If this were effected, they trust the English, in general, would be so irreconcilably disgusted, that they should be able, with or without foreign assistance, entirely to overturn the government: especially while the main of both the English and Irish forces, are at so convenient a distance.

10. But, my brethren, would this be any advantage to *you?* Can *you* hope for a more desirable form of government either in England or America, than that which you now enjoy? After all the vehement cry for liberty, what more liberty can you have? What more religious liberty

can you desire, than that which you enjoy already? May not every one among you worship God according to his own conscience? What civil liberty can you desire, which you are not already possessed of? Do not you sit without restraint, *every man under his own vine?* Do you not, every one, high or low, enjoy the fruit of your labour? This is real, rational liberty, such as is enjoyed by Englishmen alone: and not by any other people in the habitable world. Would the being independent of England make you more free? Far, very far from it. It would hardly be possible for you to steer clear, between anarchy and tyranny. But suppose, after numberless dangers and mischiefs, you should settle into one or more republics: would a republican government give you more liberty, either religious or civil? By no means. No governments under heaven are so despotic as the republican: no subjects are governed in so arbitrary a manner, as those of a commonwealth. If any one doubt of this, let him look at the subjects of Venice, of Genoa, or even of Holland. Should any man talk or write of the Dutch government as every cobbler does of the English, he would be laid in irons, before he knew where he was. And then wo be to him! Republics shew no mercy.

11. "But if we submit to one tax, more will follow." Perhaps so, and perhaps not. But if they did; if you were taxed (which is quite improbable) equal with Ireland or Scotland, still were you to prevent this by renouncing connexion with England, the remedy would be worse than the disease. For, O! what convulsions must poor America feel, before any other government was settled? Innumerable mischiefs must ensue, before any general form could be established. And the grand mischief would ensue when it was established; when you had received a yoke, which you could not shake off.

12. Brethren, open your eyes! Come to yourselves! Be no longer the dupes of designing men. I do not mean any of your countrymen in America: I doubt whether any of these are in the secret. The designing men, the Ahitho-

phels are in England; those who have laid their scheme so deep, and covered it so well, that thousands who are ripening it, suspect nothing at all of the matter. These well-meaning men, sincerely believing that they are serving their country, exclaim against grievances, which either never existed, or are aggravated above measure, and thereby inflame the people more and more, to the wish of those who are behind the scene. But be not you duped any longer; do not ruin yourselves for them that owe you no good-will, that now employ you only for their own purposes, and in the end will give you no thanks. They love neither England nor America, but play one against the other, in subserviency to their grand design of overturning the English government. Be warned in time. Stand and consider before it is too late; before you have entailed confusion and misery on your latest posterity. Have pity upon your Mother Country! Have pity upon your own! Have pity upon yourselves, upon your children, and upon all that are near and dear to you! Let us not bite and devour one another, lest we be consumed one of another! O let us follow after peace! Let us put away our sins; the real ground of all our calamities! Which never will or can be thoroughly removed, till we fear God and honour the King.

A Sermon, preached by Dr. Smith, in Philadelphia, has been lately reprinted in England. It has been much admired, but proceeds all along upon wrong suppositions. These are confuted in the preceding Tract: yet I would just touch upon them again.

Dr. Smith supposes, 1. They have a right of granting their own money: that is, of being exempt from taxation by the supreme power. If they "*contend for*" this, they contend for neither more nor less than independency. Why

then do they talk of their "rightful Sovereign?" They acknowledge no Sovereign at all.

That they contend for "the cause of liberty" is another mistaken supposition. What liberty do you want, either civil or religious? You had the very same liberty we have in England. I say, you *had:* but you have now thrown away the substance, and retain only the shadow. You have no liberty, civil or religious now, but what the Congress pleases to allow.

But you justly suppose, "We are by a plain *original* "*contract* entitled to a community of privileges, with our "brethren that reside in England, in every civil and reli-"gious respect," p. 19. Most true. And till you appointed your new Sovereigns, you enjoyed all those privileges. Indeed you had no vote for members of Parliament, neither have I, because I have no freehold in England. Yet the being taxed by the Parliament is no infringement either of my civil or religious liberty.

But you say again, "no power on earth has a right to "grant our property *without our consent*," p. 22.

Then you have no Sovereign: for every Sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects: that is, "to grant "their property, with or *without their consent*." Our Sovereign * has a right to tax me, and all other Englishmen, whether we have votes for Parliament-men or not.

Vainly, therefore, do you complain of "unconstitutional "exactions, violated rights, and mutilated charters," p. 24. Nothing is exacted, but according to the original constitution both of England and her Colonies. Your rights are no more violated than mine, when we are both taxed by the supreme power: and your charters are no more mutilated by this, than is the charter of the city of London.

Vainly do you complain of being "made slaves." Am I, or two millions of Englishmen made slaves, because we are taxed without our own consent?

* That is, in connexion with the Lords and Commons.

You may still "rejoice in the common rights of free-"men." I rejoice in all the rights of my ancestors. And every right which I enjoy, is common to Englishmen and Americans.

But shall we "surrender any part of the privileges "which we enjoy, by the *express terms* of our coloni-"zation?" that is, of our charter? By no means: and none requires it of you. None desires to with-hold any thing that is granted by the *express terms* of your charters. But remember! One of your first charters, that of Massachusetts-Bay, says in *express terms*, you are exempt from paying taxes to the King, for *seven years*: plainly implying, that after those seven years you are to pay them like other subjects. And remember your last charter, that of Pennsylvania, says, in *express terms*, you are liable to taxation.

But "a people will resume," you say, "the power, "which they never surrendered, except"—No need of any exception. They never surrendered it at all; they could not surrender it; for they never had it. I pray did *the People*, unless you mean the Norman army, give William the Conqueror his power? And to which of his successors did *the people* of England, (six or seven millions,) give the sovereign power? This is mere political cant: words without meaning. I know but one instance in all history, wherein *the people* gave the sovereign power to any one; that was, to Massaniello, of Naples. And I desire any man living to produce another instance in the history of all nations.

Ten times over, in different words, you "profess yourselves to be contending for liberty." But it is a vain, empty profession: unless you mean by that threadbare word, a liberty from obeying your rightful Sovereign, and from keeping the fundamental laws of your country. And this undoubtedly it is, which the confederated Colonies are now contending for.

How far is it the Duty of a Christian Minister to preach Politics?

1. IT is impossible to answer this question before it is understood. We must, first, therefore, endeavour to understand it; and then it will be easy to answer.

2. There is a plain command in the Bible, *Thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy people.* But notwithstanding this, many that are called religious people, speak evil of him continually. And they speak many things that are palpably false; particularly when they affirm him to be a *w—k* man; whereas a nobleman who is not at all prejudiced in his favour, when he was pressed to speak, made this honest declaration: "Sir, I know him well; and I judge the King to be one of *the most sensible* men in Europe. His ministers are no fools: but his Majesty is able *to wind them all round his finger.*"

3. Now when a clergyman comes into a place, where this, and many more stories, equally false, have been diligently propagated against the King, and are generally believed: if he guards the people against this evil speaking, by refuting those slanders, many cry out, "O, he is *preaching Politics.*"

4. If you mean this by the term, it is the bounden duty of every Christian minister to *preach politics.* It is our bounden duty to refute these vile aspersions, in public as well as in private. But this can be done only now and then, when it comes naturally in our way. For it is our main and constant business, to preach Jesus Christ and him crucified.

5. Again. Many who do not so freely censure the King, speak all manner of evil of his ministers. If any misfortune befalls us at home or abroad, by sea or land, it is "all *their* fault." If one commander in America is surprised with all his forces, when he is dead drunk, "Lord North

deserves to be hanged." If General Burgoyne or Lord Cornwallis is betrayed into their enemy's hand, all the blame is laid on our ministers at home. But still the King is wounded through their sides; the blame glances from them to him. Yet if we say a word in defence of them, (which is in effect defending him,) this also is *preaching politics.*

6. It is always difficult, and frequently impossible, for private men, to judge of the measures taken by men in public offices. We do not see many of the grounds which determine them to act, in this or the contrary manner. Generally therefore it behoves us to be silent, as we may suppose they know their own business best: but when they are censured without any colour of reason, and when an odium is cast on the King by that means, we ought to *preach politics* in this sense also: we ought publickly to confute those unjust censures. Only remembering still, that this is rarely to be done, and only when fit occasion offers: it being our main business to preach *Repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.*

LEWISHAM, *Jan.* 9, 1782.

PIECES

ON

VARIOUS SUBJECTS,

FROM THE

Methodist Magazines.

BY JOHN WESLEY, A.M.

THOUGHTS ON SALVATION BY FAITH.

1. IT is now upwards of forty years* since my Brother and I were convinced of that important truth, which is the foundation of all real religion, that *by grace we are saved through faith.* And as soon as we believed, we spoke; when we saw it ourselves, we immediately began declaring it to others. And, indeed, we could hardly speak of any thing else, either in public or private. It shone upon our minds with so strong a light, that it was our constant theme. It was our daily subject, both in verse and prose; and we vehemently defended it against all mankind.

2. But in doing this we met with abundance of difficulty: we were assaulted and abused on every side. We were every where represented as mad dogs, and treated accordingly. We were stoned in the streets, and several times narrowly escaped with our lives. In sermons, newspapers, and pamphlets of all kinds, we were painted as unheard-of monsters. But this moved us not: we went

* This was written in the year 1780.

on, by the help of God, testifying Salvation by Faith both to small and great, and not counting our lives dear unto ourselves, so we might finish our course with joy.

3. While we were thus employed, another storm arose from a quarter whence we least expected it. Some of our familiar friends declared open war against us, "for preaching Salvation by Works!" This we could not in any wise understand: we wondered what they meant. We utterly disavowed the charge: we denied it in the strongest terms. We declared over and over, both in public and private, "We believe, and constantly preach Salvation by Faith, Salvation by Works is a doctrine we abhor: we neither preach nor believe it." But it did not avail: say what we would, the same charge was still repeated: and that not only when we were at a convenient distance, but even before our face.

4. At first, we were inclined to think, that many who affirmed this, did not believe themselves; that it was merely a copy of their countenance, spoken *ad movendam invidiam.* And could we have been fully persuaded of this, the difficulty would have been solved. But we did not dare to give way to the thought: whatever they might think or say of *us*, we could not but think they were upright men, and spoke according to their real sentiments. The wonder, therefore, remained, How they could impute to us a doctrine which our soul abhorred, and which we were continually opposing, and confuting with all our might!

5. I was in this perplexity, when a thought shot across my mind, which solved the matter at once: "This is the key: those that hold, Every one is absolutely predestinated either to Salvation or Damnation, see no medium between Salvation by Works and Salvation by Absolute Decrees." It follows, that whosoever denies Salvation by Absolute Decrees, in so doing, (according to *their* apprehension) asserts Salvation by Works.

6. And herein I verily believe they are right. As averse as I once was to the thought, upon further consideration, I allow there is, there can be no medium. Either Sal-

vation is by Absolute Decree, or it is (in a *scriptural* sense) *by Works*. Yea, this I will proclaim on the house-top, there is no medium between these. You must either assert Unconditional Decrees, or (in a sound sense) Salvation by Works.

7. This deserves a fuller examination: let us consider it more attentively. If the Salvation of every man that ever was, is, or shall be finally saved, depends wholly and solely upon an Absolute, Irresistible, Unchangeable Decree of God, without any regard either to Faith or Works foreseen, then it is not, in any sense, by Works. But neither is it by Faith. For an *Unconditional* Decree excludes Faith as well as Works: since if it is either by Faith or Works foreseen, it is not by an Unconditional Decree. Therefore, Salvation by an Absolute Decree excludes both one and the other. And, consequently, upon this supposition, Salvation is neither by Faith, nor by Works.

8. If, on the other hand, we deny all Absolute Decrees, and admit only the conditional one, (the same which our blessed Lord hath revealed,) *He that believeth shall be saved;* we must, according to *their* apprehension, assert Salvation by Works. We must do this, (in a sound sense of the expression) if we believe the Bible. For seeing no faith avails, but that *which worketh by love*, which produces both inward and outward good works, to affirm, no man is finally saved without this, is in effect to affirm, no man is finally saved without Works. It is plain then, if we affirm, no man is saved by an Absolute, Unconditional Decree, but only by a Conditional one: we must expect, all who hold Unconditional Decrees, will say, We teach Salvation by Works.

9. Let none, therefore, who hold Universal Redemption be surprised at being charged with this. Let us deny it no more: let us frankly and fairly meet those who advance it upon their own ground. If they charge you with holding Salvation by Works, answer plainly, "In *your* sense I do: for I deny that our final salvation depends upon any Absolute Unconditional Decree. If, therefore, there be no

medium, I do hold Salvation by Works. But observe! In allowing this, I allow no more than that I am no Calvinist. So that by my making you this concession, you gain—just nothing."

10. I am, therefore, still consistent with myself, as well as consistent with the Bible. I still hold, (as I have done above these forty years,) that *by grace we are saved through faith;* yet so as not to contradict that other expression of the same Apostle, *Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* Mean time, those who maintain Absolute Predestination, who hold Decrees that have no Condition at all, cannot be consistent with themselves, unless they deny Salvation by Faith, as well as Salvation by Works. For if only *he that believeth shall be saved,* then is Faith a Condition of Salvation. And God hath decreed, from all eternity, that it should be such. But if the Decree admit of any Condition, it is not an Unconditional Decree. Either, therefore, you must renounce your Unconditional Decrees, or deny that Faith is the Condition of Salvation: or, (which is just the same thing,) affirm, that a man may be saved without either Faith or Works.

11. And I am consistent with myself, as well as with the Bible, when I affirm, that none shall be finally saved, by any *faith* but that *which worketh by love,* both Inward and Outward Holiness. I fear many of them that hold Unconditional Decrees, are not sensible of this. For they seriously believe themselves to be in the high road to Salvation, though they are far from Inward (if not Outward) Holiness. They have not *put on humbleness of mind, bowels of mercy, brotherly-kindness.* They have no gentleness, no meekness, no long-suffering; so far are they from the *love that endureth all things.* They are under the power of sin; of evil-surmising; of anger: yea, of outward sin. For they scruple not to say to their brother, *Thou fool!* They not only, on a slight provocation, make no scruple of rendering evil for evil, of returning railing for railing: but they bring railing accusations unprovoked: they pour out floods of the lowest, basest invectives. And

yet they are within the Decree! I instance in the two late publications of Mr. Rowland Hill. "O," says Mr. Hill, "but Mr. Wesley is a wicked man." What then! Is he more wicked than he that *disputed with Michael, about the body of Moses?* How then durst he bring a railing accusation against a man, when an Archangel durst not bring one against the devil? O fight, fight for an Unconditional Decree! For if there be any Condition, how can you be saved?

FURTHER THOUGHTS

ON

NECESSITY.

I. 1. THE late ingenious Dr. Hartley, in his Essay on Man, resolves all *thoughts* into *vibrations* of the brain. When any of the fine fibres of the brain are moved, so as to vibrate to and fro, then (according to his scheme) a perception or *sensation* is the natural consequence. These sensations are at first *simple*, but are afterwards variously *compounded*: till, by farther vibrations, ideas of *reflection* are added to ideas of sensation. By the additional vibrations of this curious organ, our *judgments* of things are also formed. And from the same fruitful source arise our *reasonings* in their endless variety.

2. From our apprehensions of things, from our judgments and reasonings concerning them, all our *passions* arise: whether those which are more sudden and transient, or those of a permanent nature. And from the several mixtures and modifications of these, our *tempers* or *dispositions* flow: very nearly, if not altogether the same with what are usually termed *virtues* or *vices*.

3. Our passions and tempers are the immediate source of all our *words* and *actions*. Of consequence, these likewise depending on our passions, and our passions on our judgments and apprehensions, all our actions, passions, and judgments are ultimately resolvable into the vibrations of

the brain. And all of them together follow each other, in one connected chain.

4. "But you will say, (says the Doctor,) this infers the universal necessity of human actions. I am sorry for it: but I cannot help it." But since he saw this destroyed the very essence of morality, leaving no room for either virtue or vice, why did he publish it to the world? Why? Because his brain vibrated in such a manner, that he could not help it.

Alas for poor human nature! If this is so, where is "The dignity of man?"

II. 1. But other great men totally disapprove of the doctrine of vibrations. They give an entirely different account of this whole affair. They say, the delicate, soft, and almost fluid substance, of which the brain is composed, is absolutely incapable of such vibrations, as the Doctor ascribes to it: but that the animal spirits, whatever they are, continually moving through that soft substance, naturally form various *traces* therein; first, very simple, then less or more compounded: that these are afterward varied innumerable ways; and that from these simple or compounded traces, arise simple or compounded ideas, whether of sensation or reflection. From these result the judgments we form, with all our train of reasonings. And at a little farther remove, our passions, our tempers, and from these our words a actions.

2. t a easy to observe, that this scheme equally infers the universal necessity of human actions. The premises indeed are a little different, but the conclusion is one and the same. If every thought, word, and action, necessarily depends upon those traces in the brain, which are formed whether we will or not, without either our consent or knowledge: then the man has no more liberty in thinking, speaking, or acting, than the stone has in falling.

III. That great man, President Edwards, of New England, places this in a still stronger light. He says,

1. The whole frame of this world wherein we are placed is so constituted, that without our choice, visible objects

affect our eyes, sounds strike upon the ear; and the other things which surround us affect the other bodily organs, according to their several natures.

2. The *nerves*, which are spread all over the body, without any choice of ours, convey the impression made on the outward organ to the common sensory; supposed to be lodged, either in the pineal gland, or in some other part of the brain.

3. Immediately, without our choice the perception or sensation follows.

4. The simple apprehension (analagous to sensation) furnishes us with simple ideas.

5. These ideas are more and more associated together, still without our choice: and we understand, judge, reason, accordingly: yea, love, hate, joy, grieve, hope, or fear.

6. And according to our passions we speak and act. Where is liberty then? It is excluded. All you see is one connected chain, fixed as the pillars of heaven.

IV. To the same effect, though with a little variation, speaks the ingenious Lord Kaim. He says,

"The universe is one immense machine, one amazing piece of clock work, consisting of innumerable wheels, fitly framed, and indissolubly linked together. Man is one of these wheels, fixed in the middle of this vast automaton. And he moves just as necessarily as the rest, as the sun, or moon, or earth. Only with this difference, (which was necessary for completing the design of the Great Artificer,) that he *seems* to himself perfectly free; he *imagines* that he is unnecessitated, and master of his own motions: whereas in truth he no more directs or moves himself, than any other wheel in the machine."

The general inference then is still the same: the point which all these so laboriously endeavour to prove is, that inevitable Necessity governs all things, and men have no more liberty than stones!

V. 1. But allowing all this: allowing (in a sense) all that Dr. Hartley, Edwards, and their associates contend for:

what discovery have they made? What new thing have they found out? What does all this amount to? With infinite pains, with immense parade, with the utmost ostentation of mathematical and metaphysical learning, they have discovered just as much as they might have found in one single line of the Bible:

Without me ye can do nothing! Absolutely, positively nothing! Seeing, *in him all things live and move*, as well as *have their being*: seeing, he is not only the true *primum mobile*, containing the whole frame of creation, but likewise the inward, sustaining, acting principle, indeed the only proper Agent in the universe: unless so far as he imparts a spark of his active, self-moving nature, to created spirits. But more especially *ye can do nothing right*, nothing wise, nothing good, without the direct, immediate agency of the First Cause.

2. Let the trial be made. And, first, what can *Reason* all-sufficient Reason, do in this matter? Let us try, upon Dr. Hartley's scheme? Can it prevent or alter the *vibrations* of the brain? Can it prevent or alter the various *compositions* of them? Or cut off the connexion between these and our apprehensions, judgments, reasonings? Or between these and our passions? Or that between our passions, and our words and actions? Not at all. Reason can do nothing in this matter. In spite of all our reason, nature will keep its course, will hold on its way, and utterly bear down its feeble opponent.

3. And what can Reason do, upon the second supposition? Can it prevent or alter the *traces* in the brain? Not a jot more than it could the vibrations. They laugh at all its power. Can it cut off the connexion between those traces and our apprehensions: or that between our apprehensions, and our passions? Or between our passions and actions? Nothing at all of this. It may see the evil, but it cannot help it.

4. Try what Reason can do upon the third supposition, that of President Edwards. Can it change the appearances

of things that surround us? Or the impression which the nerves convey to the common sensory? Or the sensation that follows? Or the apprehension? Or can it cut off the connexion between our apprehensions of things and our passions? Or that between our passions and our actions? Poor, impotent reason! It can do neither more nor less in any of these matters. It cannot alter the outward constitution of things; the nature of light, sound, or the other objects that surround us. It cannot prevent their affecting our senses thus and thus. And then, will not all the rest follow?

5. Make a trial, if Reason can do any more, upon Lord Kaim's supposition. Can it in any degree alter the nature of the universal machine? Can it change or stop the motion of any one wheel? Utterly impossible.

6. Has *Free-will* any more power in these respects than Reason? Let the trial be made upon each of these schemes.

What can it do upon Dr. Hartley's scheme? Can our Free-will alter one *vibration* of the brain? What can it do upon the second scheme? Can it erase or alter one of the *traces* formed there? What can it do upon Dr. Edwards's? Can it alter the appearances of the things that surround us? Or the impressions they make upon the nerves? Or the natural consequences of them? Can it do any thing more on Lord Kaim's scheme? Can it any ways alter the constitution of the great clock? Stand still! Look awhile into your own breast! What can your will do in any of these matters? Ah poor Free-will! Does not plain experience shew, it is as impotent as your Reason? Let it stand then as an eternal truth, *Without me ye can do nothing.*

VI. 1. But in the same old book there is another word, *I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.* Here the charm is dissolved! The light breaks in, and the shadows flee away.

One of these sentences should never be viewed apart

from the other: each receives light from the other. God hath joined them together, and let no man put them asunder.

Now taking this into the account, I care not one pin, for all Dr. Hartley can say of his *vibrations*. Allowing the whole which he contends for, allowing all the links of his mathematical chain, to be as indissolubly joined together, as are the propositions in Euclid: suppose vibrations, perceptions, judgments, passions, tempers, actions, ever so naturally follow each other: what is all this to the God of Nature? Cannot he stop, alter, annihilate, any or all of these, in whatever manner, and in whatever moment he pleases? Away then with all these fine wrought speculations! Sweep them off as a spider's web! Scatter them in the wind! How helpless soever they may be, *who are without God in the world:* however they may groan under the iron hand of dire Necessity: necessity has no power over those, *who have the Lord for their God.* Each of these can say, through happy experience, *I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.*

2. Again. Allowing all the minute philosophers can say, of the *traces* formed in the brain, and of perceptions, judgments, passions, tempers, words, and actions, naturally flowing therefrom: whatever dreadful consequences may follow from hence, with regard to those who know not God, who have only natural Reason and Free-will to oppose the power of Nature: (which we know to have no more force, than a thread of tow that has touched the fire) under the influence of the God of Nature, we laugh all our enemies to scorn. He can alter or efface all these *traces*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. Still, although *without him I can do nothing, I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.*

3. Yet again. Let Dr. Edwards say all he will or can, concerning the outward *appearances* of things, as giving rise to *sensations*, *associations* of ideas, passions, dispositions, and actions: allowing this to be the *course of Nature:* what then? See, One superior to Nature! What is

the course of Nature to him? By a word, a nod, he turneth it upside down!

His power inverted Nature owns,
Her only law, his sovereign word.

Let your chain be wrought ever so firm: he nods, and it flies in pieces. He touches it, and all the links fall asunder, as unconnected as the sand.

4. Once more. After Lord Kaim has said all he pleases, concerning the grand machine of the universe, and concerning the connexion of its several wheels, yet it must be allowed, he that made it, can unmake it: can vary every wheel, every spring, every movement, at his own good pleasure. Neither therefore does this imply any necessity, laid either upon the thoughts, passions, or actions, of those that know and trust in him, who is the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth.

5. Ah poor infidel! This is no comfort to *you!* You must plunge on in the fatal whirlpool! You are without hope! Without help! For there is only one possible help: and that you spurn. What follows then? Why

Dum adamantinos
Figit dira necessitas
Clavos, non animum metu,
Non mortis laqueis expediet caput.

Oh what advantage has a Christian (a *real* Christian) over an Infidel! He sees God! Consequently

——— Metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari.

He tramples on inexorable fate,
And fear, and death, and hell!

6. Ah poor Predestinarian! If you are true to your doctrine, this is no comfort to *you!* For perhaps you are not of the elect number: if so, you are in the whirlpool too. For what is your hope? Where is your help? There is no help for you in your God. *Your* God! No. He is not yours: he never was; he never will be. He that made you, he that called you into being, has no pity upon you! He made you for this very end, to damn you; to cast you

headlong into a lake of fire burning with brimstone! This was prepared for you, or ever the world began! And for this you are now reserved in chains of darkness, till the decree brings forth; till, according to his eternal, unchangeable, irresistible will,

> You groan, you howl, you writhe in waves of fire,
> And pour forth blasphemies *at his desire!*

Oh God, how long shall this doctrine stand?

ON HEARING MINISTERS WHO OPPOSE THE TRUTH.

1. LAST summer I received a letter from Yorkshire, signed by several serious men, who proposed a difficulty they were under, wherein they knew not how to act. And indeed I did not well know how to advise them. So I delayed giving them a determinate answer, till I could lay the matter before our Brethren, at the ensuing Conference.

2. Their difficulty was this. "You advise all the members of our Societies, constantly to attend the Service of the Church. We have done so for a considerable time. But very frequently Mr. R., our Minister, preaches not only what we believe to be false, but dangerously false doctrine. He asserts, and endeavours to prove, That we annot be saved from our sins in this life, and that we must not hope to be perfected in love, on this side eternity. Our nature is very willing to receive this; therefore it is very liable to hurt us. Hence we have a doubt, whether it is our duty, to hear this preaching, which experience shews to weaken our souls."

3. This Letter I laid before the Conference, and we easily perceived, the difficulty therein proposed, concerned not only the Society at Bailden, but many others, in various parts of the kingdom. It was, therefore, considered at large, and all our Brethren were desired to speak their

sentiments freely. In the conclusion, they unanimously agreed, 1. That it was highly expedient, all the Methodists (so called) who had been bred therein, should attend the service of the Church as often as possible: but that, 2dly, if the Minister began either to preach the Absolute Decrees, or to rail at, and ridicule Christian Perfection, they should quietly and silently go out of the Church; yet attend it again the next opportunity.

4. I have since that time, revolved this matter over and over in my own mind. And the more I consider it, the more I am convinced, this was the best Answer that could be given. I still advise all our Friends, when this case occurs, quietly and silently to go out. Only I must earnestly caution them, not to be critical: not to make a man an offender for a word; no, nor for a few sentences, which any who believe the Decrees may drop without design. But if such a Minister should at any time, deliberately and of set purpose, endeavour to establish Absolute Predestination, or to confute Scriptural Perfection; then I advise all the Methodists in the Congregation, quietly to go away.

JOHN WESLEY.

Lewisham, Jan. 9, 1782.

THOUGHTS CONCERNING GOSPEL-MINISTERS.

1. How frequently do we hear this expression, from the mouths of rich and poor, learned and unlearned? Many lament, that they have not a Gospel-Minister in their Church, and therefore are constrained to seek one at the Meeting. Many rejoice that they have a Gospel-Minister, and that there are many such in their neighbourhood. Mean time they generally speak with much displeasure, if not contempt of those, who, they say, are not Gospel-Ministers.

2. But it is to be feared, few of these understand what they say. Few understand what that expression means. Most that use it, have only crude, confused notions concerning Gospel-Ministers. And hence many inconveniences arise; yea much hurt to the souls of men. They contract prejudices in favour of very worthless men, who are indeed blind leaders of the blind; not knowing what the real Gospel is, and therefore incapable of preaching it to others. Mean time from the same cause they contract prejudices against other Ministers, who in reality both live and preach the Gospel: and therefore are well able to instruct them in all those truths that accompany salvation.

3. But what then is the meaning of the expression? Who is a Gospel-Minister? Let us consider this important question calmly, in the fear and in the presence of God.

Not every one that preaches the *Eternal Decrees*: (although many suppose, this is the very thing!) that talks much of the *Sovereignty* of God, of *free, distinguishing Grace;* of dear *Electing Love;* of *irresistible Grace*, and of the infallible *Perseverance* of the Saints. A man may speak of all these, by the hour together: yea, with all his heart, and with all his voice: and yet have no right at all to the title of a Gospel-Minister.

Not every one that talks largely and earnestly on (those precious subjects) *the righteousness and blood of Christ.* Let a man descant upon these in ever so lively a manner, let him describe his sufferings ever so pathetically: if he stops there; if he does not shew man's duty, as well as Christ's sufferings; if he does not apply all to the consciences of the hearers: he will never lead them to life, either here or hereafter, and, therefore, is no Gospel-Minister.

Not every one who deals in the promises only, without ever shewing the terrors of the law: that slides over *the wrath of God revealed from heaven, against all ungodliness and unrighteousness*, and endeavours to heal those that

never were wounded. These *Promise-mongers* are no Gospel-Ministers.

Not every one (very nearly allied to the former) who bends all his strength to *coax* sinners to Christ: such soft, tender expressions, as "My *dear* hearers, my *dear lambs*," though repeated a thousand times, do not prove a man to be a Minister.

Lastly, not every one that preaches *Justification by Faith;* he that goes no farther than this, that does not insist upon Sanctification also, upon all the fruits of Faith; upon Universal Holiness: does not declare the whole counsel of God: and consequently is not a Gospel-Minister.

4. Who then is such? Who is a Gospel-Minister, in the full, scriptural sense of the word? He and he alone, of whatever denomination, that does declare the whole counsel of God: that does preach the whole Gospel, even Justification and Sanctification preparatory to glory. He that does not put asunder what God has joined; but publishes alike, *Christ dying for us, and Christ living in us.* He that constantly applies all this to the hearts of the hearers, being willing to spend and be spent for them: having himself the mind which was in Christ, and steadily walking as Christ also walked: he, and he alone, can with propriety be termed, *A Gospel-Minister.*

5. Let it be particularly observed, if the Gospel be "Glad tidings of *great salvation* which shall be unto *all people;*" then those only are, in the full sense, Gospel-Ministers who proclaim the *Great Salvation,* that is, Salvation from *all* (both inward and outward) *sin,* into *all the mind that was in Christ Jesus;* and likewise proclaim offers of this salvation to every child of man. This honourable title is therefore vilely prostituted, when it is given to any but those who testify, *That God willeth all men to be saved,* and *to be perfect as their Father which is in heaven is perfect.*

THOUGHTS

UPON

METHODISM.

1. I AM not afraid, that the people called Methodists, should ever cease to exist either in Europe or America. But I am afraid, lest they should only exist as a dead Sect, having the form of Religion without the power. And this undoubtedly will be the case, unless they hold fast both the Doctrine, Spirit, and Discipline with which they first set out.

2. What was their fundamental Doctrine? That the Bible is the whole and sole rule both of Christian Faith and Practice. Hence they learned, 1. That Religion is an inward Principle; that it is no other than the mind that was in Christ: or in other words, the renewal of the soul after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness: 2. That this can never be wrought in us, but by the power of the Holy Ghost: 3. That we receive this and every other blessing, merely for the sake of Christ; and, 4. That whosoever hath the mind that was in Christ, the same is our brother, and sister, and mother.

3. In the year 1729, four young Students in Oxford, agreed to spend their evenings together. They were all zealous members of the Church of England, and had no peculiar opinions, but were distinguished only by their constant attendance on the Church and Sacrament. In 1735, they were increased to fifteen: when the chief of them embarked for America, intending to preach to the heathen Indians. Methodism then seemed to die away; but it

revived again in the year 1738. Especially after Mr. Wesley (not being allowed to preach in the Churches) began to preach in the fields. One and another then coming to inquire, What they must do to be saved, he desired them to meet him all together, which they did, and increased continually in number. In November, a large building, the Foundry, being offered him, he began preaching therein, morning and evening; at five in the morning, and seven in the evening, that the people's labour might not be hindered.

4. From the beginning, the men and women sat apart, as they always did in the Primitive Church. And none were suffered to call any place their own, but the first comers sat down first. They had no pews; and all the benches for rich and poor, were of the same construction. Mr. Wesley began the Service with a short prayer; then sung a hymn and preached, (usually about half an hour) then sang a few verses of another hymn, and concluded with prayer. His constant doctrine was, Salvation by Faith, preceded by Repentance, and followed by Holiness.

5. But when a large number of people was joined, the great difficulty was, to keep them together. For they were continually scattering hither and thither, and we knew no way to help it. But God provided for this also, when we thought not of it. A year or two after, Mr. Wesley met the chief of the Society in Bristol, and inquired, "How shall we pay the debt upon the Preaching-house?" Captain Foy stood up and said, "Let every one in the Society give a penny a week, and it will easily be done." "But many of them," said one, "have not a penny to give." "True," said the Captain: then put ten or twelve of them to me. Let each of these give what they can weekly, and I will supply what is wanting." Many others made the same offer. So Mr. Wesley divided the Societies among them: assigning a Class of about twelve persons, to each of these who were termed Leaders.

6. Not long after one of these informed Mr. Wesley that, calling on such a one in his house, he found him quarrel-

ling with his wife. Another was found in drink. It immediately struck into Mr. Wesley's mind, This is the very thing we wanted. The Leaders are the persons, who may not only receive the contributions, but also watch over the souls of their brethren. The Society in London being informed of this, willingly followed the example of that in Bristol. As did every Society from that time, whether in Europe or America. By this means it was easily found, if any grew weary or faint, and help was speedily administered. And if any walked disorderly, they were quickly discovered, and either amended or dismissed.

7. For those who knew in whom they had believed, there was another help provided. Five or six, either married or single men, met together at such an hour as was convenient, according to the direction of St. James, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, and ye shall be healed." And five or six of the married or single women met together for the same purpose. Innumerable blessings have attended this institution, especially in those who were *going on to perfection*. When any seemed to have attained this, they were allowed to meet with a select number, who appeared, so far as man could judge, to be partakers of the same *great salvation*.

8. From this short sketch of Methodism (so called) any man of understanding may easily discern, that it is only plain, scriptural Religion, guarded by a few prudential regulations. The essence of it is holiness of heart and life: the circumstantials all point to this. And as long as they are joined together in the people called Methodists, no weapon formed against them shall prosper. But if even the circumstantial parts are despised, the essential will soon be lost. And if ever the essential parts should evaporate, what remains will be dung and dross.

9. It nearly concerns us to understand how the case stands with us at present. I fear, wherever Riches have increased (exceeding few are the exceptions) the essence of Religion, the mind that was in Christ, has decreased in the same proportion. Therefore I do not see how it is

possible, in the nature of things, for any revival of true Religion to continue long. For Religion must necessarily produce both Industry and Frugality. And these cannot but produce Riches. But as Riches increase, so will Pride, Anger, and Love of the world in all its branches.

10. How then is it possible that Methodism, that is, the Religion of the heart, though it flourishes now as a green bay-tree, should continue in this state? For the Methodists in every place grow diligent and frugal: consequently they increase in goods. Hence they proportionably increase in pride, in anger, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life. So, although the form of Religion remains, the spirit is swiftly vanishing away.

11. Is there no way to prevent this? This continual declension of pure Religion? We ought not to forbid people to be diligent and frugal: we *must* exhort all Christians, to gain all they can, and to save all they can: that is, in effect, to grow rich! What way then (I ask again) can we take that our money may not sink us to the nethermost hell? There is one way, and there is no other under heaven. If those who *gain all they can*, and *save all they can*, will likewise *give all they can*, then the more they gain, the more they will grow in grace, and the more treasure they will lay up in heaven.

London, Aug. 4, 1786.

THOUGHTS

ON

The Manner of educating Children.

1. A Gentleman with whom I was conversing awhile ago, was speaking largely on the manner of educating Children. He objected strongly to the bringing them up too strictly, to the giving them more of Religion than they liked: to the telling them of it too often, or pressing it upon them whether they will or not. He said, he never pressed it upon his own children, but only spoke of it occasionally in their hearing; and if they appeared affected, then answered their questions, or perhaps spoke to them directly. He thought that the common methods that are used in those that are called Religious Schools, of talking about divine things continually, and daily pressing it upon children, did abundantly more harm than good; especially if any severity were used; and concluded with saying, that those children who had been trained up in this manner, as soon as the restraint was taken off, were commonly worse than others.

2. As all this was perfectly new to me, I made little answer for the present: but it put me upon much thought! I knew it was quite agreeable to the sentiments of Rousseau, in his Emilius, the most empty, silly, injudicious rant, that ever a self-conceited infidel wrote. But I knew it was quite contrary to the judgment of the wisest and best men I have known. I thought, if these things are so,

how much mischief have we done unawares? How much hurt has Miss Bosanquet (now Mrs. Fletcher) been doing in the world for many years! How much more have the Miss Owens done, spoiling twenty children at a time! How much mischief is Miss Bishop likely to do! Perhaps more than even the Miss Owens! Above all, how much mischief has been done, and is now doing at Kingswood! Where (if this hypothesis be true) we are continually ruining fifty children at a time!

3. "But be this as it may, I urge the matter of fact against such an Education. The Children educated thus, are, when grown up, actually worse than other men or women." I doubt the fact: nay, that is not enough: I totally deny it. As frequently as this has been affirmed, it is notoriously false. Some few, and very few of those women, that were brought up by Miss Bosanquet or Miss Owen, either never were converted to God, (perhaps never convinced of sin,) or *have made shipwreck of the faith*, and at the same time, of its attendant, *a good conscience*. And undoubtedly these would be worse than others, than those who had not so grieved the Holy Spirit of God. The same may be said of some of those men that were educated at Kingswood School. If they quenched the Spirit, they would be worse than those that never were partakers of it. But this proves nothing, unless it were a general case, which is not by any means true. Many both of the women who were educated by Miss Bosanquet or Miss Owen, and of the men who were educated at Kingswood, are holy in heart and in life, and trust they shall praise God to all eternity, that ever they saw those schools.

4. Yet I allow that what is commonly called a Religious Education, frequently does more hurt than good: and that many of the persons who were so educated, are sinners above other men, yea, and have contracted an enmity to Religion, which usually continues all their lives. And this will naturally be the case, if either the religion wherein they are instructed, or the manner of instructing them be wrong. But in most of those that are termed Religious

Schools, there is a grand error either in the former or the latter instance.

5. With regard to the former, how few are there of those that undertake the education of children, who understand the nature of Religion: who know what true Religion is! Some of them supposing it to be barely the doing no harm, the abstaining from outward sin; some, the using the means of grace, saying our prayers, reading good books, and the like: and others the having a train of right opinions, which is vulgarly called Faith. But all these, however common in the world, are gross and capital errors. Unless Religion be described as consisting in holy tempers, in the love of God and our neighbour, in humility, gentleness, patience, long-suffering, contentedness in every condition; to sum up all, in the image of God, in the mind that was in Christ: it is no wonder if these that are instructed therein are not better, but worse than other men. For they think they have religion, when indeed they have none at all, and so add pride to all their other vices.

6. But suppose those that educate them judge right, with regard to the nature of religion, they may still be mistaken with regard to the manner of instilling it into children. They may not have the spirit of government, to which some even good men are utter strangers. They may habitually lean to this or that extreme, of remissness or of severity. And if they either give children too much of their own will, or needlessly and churlishly restrain them; if they either use no punishment at all, or more than is necessary, the leaning either to one extreme or the other, may frustrate all their endeavours. In the latter case, it will not be strange, if religion stink in the nostrils of those that were so educated. They will naturally look upon it as an austere, melancholy thing; and if they think it necessary to salvation, they will esteem it a necessary evil, and so put it off as long as possible.

7. But does it follow, that we ought not to instil true religion into the minds of children as early as possible? Or rather that we should do it, with all diligence, from the

how much mischief have we done unawares? How much hurt has Miss Bosanquet (now Mrs. Fletcher) been doing in the world for many years! How much more have the Miss Owens done, spoiling twenty children at a time! How much mischief is Miss Bishop likely to do! Perhaps more than even the Miss Owens! Above all, how much mischief has been done, and is now doing at Kingswood! Where (if this hypothesis be true) we are continually ruining fifty children at a time!

3. "But be this as it may, I urge the matter of fact against such an Education. The Children educated thus, are, when grown up, actually worse than other men or women." I doubt the fact: nay, that is not enough: I totally deny it. As frequently as this has been affirmed, it is notoriously false. Some few, and very few of those women, that were brought up by Miss Bosanquet or Miss Owen, either never were converted to God, (perhaps never convinced of sin,) or *have made shipwreck of the faith*, and at the same time, of its attendant, *a good conscience*. And undoubtedly these would be worse than others, than those who had not so grieved the Holy Spirit of God. The same may be said of some of those men that were educated at Kingswood School. If they quenched the Spirit, they would be worse than those that never were partakers of it. But this proves nothing, unless it were a general case, which is not by any means true. Many both of the women who were educated by Miss Bosanquet or Miss Owen, and of the men who were educated at Kingswood, are holy in heart and in life, and trust they shall praise God to all eternity, that ever they saw those schools.

4. Yet I allow that what is commonly called a Religious Education, frequently does more hurt than good: and that many of the persons who were so educated, are sinners above other men, yea, and have contracted an enmity to Religion, which usually continues all their lives. And this will naturally be the case, if either the religion wherein they are instructed, or the manner of instructing them be wrong. But in most of those that are termed Religious

THOUGHTS

ON

The Manner of educating Children.

1. A Gentleman with whom I was conversing awhile ago, was speaking largely on the manner of educating Children. He objected strongly to the bringing them up too strictly, to the giving them more of Religion than they liked; to the telling them of it too often, or pressing it upon them whether they will or not. He said, he never pressed it upon his own children, but only spoke of it occasionally in their hearing; and if they appeared affected, then answered their questions, or perhaps spoke to them directly. He thought that the common methods that are used in those that are called Religious Schools, of talking about divine things continually, and daily pressing it upon children, did abundantly more harm than good; especially if any severity were used; and concluded with saying, that those children who had been trained up in this manner, as soon as the restraint was taken off, were commonly worse than others.

2. As all this was perfectly new to me, I made little answer for the present: but it put me upon much thought! I knew it was quite agreeable to the sentiments of Rousseau, in his Emilius, the most empty, silly, injudicious thing, that ever a self-conceited infidel wrote. But I knew it was quite contrary to the judgment of the wisest and best men I have known. I thought, if these things are so,

very time that reason dawns? Laying line upon line, precept upon precept, as soon and as fast as they are able to bear it? By all means. Scripture, Reason, and Experience, jointly testify, that inasmuch as the corruption of nature is earlier than our instructions can be, we should take all pains and care, to counteract this corruption, as early as possible. The bias of nature is set the wrong way: education is designed to set it right. This, by the grace of God is to turn the bias from self-will, pride, anger, revenge, and the love of the world, to resignation, lowliness, meekness, and the love of God. And from the moment we perceive any of those evil roots springing up, it is our business immediately to check their growth, if we cannot yet root them out. As far as this can be done by mildness, softness, and gentleness, certainly it should be done. But sometimes these methods will not avail, and then we must correct with kind severity. For where tenderness will not remove the fault, *He that spareth the rod, spoileth the child.* To deny this, is to give the lie to the God of truth, and to suppose we can govern better than he. For *whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.*

8. In the name of God, then, and by the authority of his word, let all that have children, from the time they begin to speak or run alone, begin to train them up in the way wherein they should go: to counter-work the corruption of their nature with all possible assiduity: to do every thing in their power to cure self-will, pride, and every other wrong temper. Then let them be delivered to instructors (if such can be found) that will tread in the same steps; that will watch over them as immortal spirits, who are shortly to appear before God, and who have nothing to do in this world, but to prepare to meet him in the clouds, seeing they will be eternally happy, if they are ready; if not, eternally miserable.

AN ANSWER TO MR. DODD.

1. YOU and I may the more easily bear with each other, because we are both of us *rapid* Writers, and, therefore, the more liable to mistake. I will thank you for shewing me any mistake I am in: being not so tenacious of my opinions now, as I was twenty or thirty years ago: Indeed I am not fond of any opinion as such. I read the Bible with what attention I can, and regulate all my opinions thereby, to the best of my understanding. But I am always willing to receive more light; particularly with regard to any less common opinions, because the explaining and defending of them takes up much time, which I can ill spare from other employments. Whoever, therefore, will give me more light, with regard to Christian Perfection, will do me a singular favour. The opinion I have concerning it at present, I espouse merely because I think it is scriptural. If, therefore, I am convinced it is not scriptural, I shall willingly relinquish it.

2. I have no particular fondness for the term. It seldom occurs either in my preaching or writings. It is my opponents who thrust it upon me continually, and ask me, What I mean by it? So did Bishop Gibson, till by his advice, I publickly declared, What I *did not* mean by it, and what *I did*. This I supposed might be best done in the form of a Sermon, having a text prefixed, wherein that term occurred. But that text is there used only as an occasion or introduction to the subject. I do not build any doctrine thereupon, nor undertake critically to explain it.

3. What is the meaning of the term *Perfection*, is another question; but that it is a *Scriptural Term* is unde-

niable. Therefore none ought to object to the use of the *Term*, whatever they may do to this or that *Explication* of it. I am very willing to consider whatever you have to object, to what is advanced under the first head of that Sermon. But I still think that *Perfection* is only another term for *Holiness*, or the image of God in man. *God made man perfect*, I think is just the same, as, he made him *holy*, or *in his own image*. And you are the very first person I ever read of or spoke with, who made any doubt of it. Now *this Perfection* does certainly admit of degrees. Therefore I readily allow the propriety of that distinction, Perfection of Kinds, and Perfection of Degrees. Nor do I remember one Writer, ancient or modern, who excepts against it.

4. In the Sermon of Salvation by Faith I say, "He that is born of God sinneth not," (a proposition explained at large in another Sermon) and every where either explicitly or virtually connected with, *while he keepeth himself*, "by any sinful Desire. Any unholy Desire he stifleth in the Birth." (Assuredly he does, *while he keepeth himself.)* "Nor doth he sin by infirmities. For his infirmities have no concurrence of his will, and without this they are not properly sins." Taking the words as they lie in connexion thus, (and taken otherwise they are not *my* words but *yours*,) I must still aver, they speak both my own experience, and that of many hundreds of the children of God whom I personally know. And all this, with abundantly more than this, is contained in that single expression, "The loving God with all our heart, and serving him with all our strength." Nor did I ever say or mean any more by Perfection, than *thus* loving and serving God. But I dare not say *less* than this. For it might be attended with worse consequences than you seem to be aware of. If there be a mistake, it is far more dangerous on the one side than on the other. If I set the mark too high, I drive men into needless fears; if you set it too low, you drive them into hell-fire.

5. We agree, that true "Christianity implies a destruction of the Kingdom of Sin, and a renewal of the soul in

Righteousness: which even babes in Christ do in a measure experience; though not in so large a measure as young men and fathers?" But here we divide, I believe even babes in Christ *(while they keep themselves) do not commit sin.* By *sin* I mean outward sin; and the word *commit* I take, in its plain, literal meaning. And this I think is fully proved by all the texts cited Sermon III. from the sixth chapter to the Romans. Nor do I conceive there is any material difference between *committing sin* and *continuing therein.* I tell my neighbour here, "*William,* you are a child of the devil: for you *commit sin:* you were drunk yesterday." No, Sir, says the man; I do not *live* or *continue in sin,* (which Mr. Dodd says is the true meaning of the text,) I am not drunk *continually,* but only now and then, once in a fortnight, or once in a month." Now, Sir, how shall I deal with this man? Shall I tell him, he is in the way to heaven or hell? I think, he is in the high road to destruction, and that if I tell him otherwise, his blood will be upon my head. And all that you say, of *living, continuing in, serving sin,* as different from *committing* it, and of its *not reigning,* not having *dominion* over him, who still frequently *commits* it, is making so many *loop-holes* whereby any impenitent sinner may escape from all the terrors of the Lord. I dare not, therefore, give up the plain, literal meaning either of St. Paul's or St. Peter's words.

6. As to those of St. John (cited Sermon V.) I do not think you have proved they are not to be taken literally. In every single act of obedience, as well as in a continued course of it, ποιει δικαιοσυνην· And in either an act or a course of sin, ποιει αμαρτιαν. Therefore, that I may give no countenance to any kind or degree of sin, I shall interpret these words by those in the fifth chapter, and believe, *He that is born of God* (while he keepeth himself) *sinneth not:* doth not commit outward sin.

7. But "It is absolutely necessary, as you observe, to add sometimes explanatory words to those of the sacred Penmen." It is so: to add words *explanatory* of their

sense; but not *subversive* of it. The words added to this text, *Ye know all things*, are such. And you yourself allow them so to be. But I do not allow the words *wilfully and habitually* to be such. These do not explain but overthrow the text. That the first Fathers thus explained it, I deny: as also that I ever spoke lightly of them.

8. You proceed. "You allow in another Sermon, in evident contradiction to yourself, that the true children of God *could* and *did* commit sin." This is no contradiction to any thing I ever advanced. I every where allow, that a Child of God *can* and *will* commit sin, *if he does not keep himself*. "But this, you say, is nothing to the present argument." Yes, it is the whole thing. If they *keep themselves*, they do not; otherwise they *can* and *do* commit sin. I say nothing contrary to this in either sermon. But "hence you say, we conclude, *That he who is* born of God, *may possibly commit sin*." An idle conclusion as ever was formed. For whoever denied it? I flatly affirm it in both the Sermons, and in the very paragraph now before us. The only conclusion which I deny, is, That "all Christians *do and will commit sin as long as they live*." Now this you yourself (though you seem to start at it) maintain from the beginning of your letter to the end: viz. That all Christians *do sin* and *cannot but sin*, more or less, to their lives end. Therefore I do not "*artfully put* this conclusion;" but it is your own conclusion, from your own premises. Indeed were I *artfully* to *put* in any thing, in expounding the word of God, I must be an errant knave. But I do not: my conscience bears me witness, that I speak the very truth, so far as I know it, in simplicity and godly sincerity.

9. I think that all this time you are directly pleading for *looseness of manners*, and that every thing you advance naturally tends thereto. This is my grand objection to that doctrine of the *necessity of sinning*. Not only that it is false, but that it is directly subversive of all holiness. The doctrine of the *Gnosticks*, was not that of a Child of God *does not commit sin*, i. e. Act the things which are forbidden

in Scripture: but that they are *not sin* in him; that he is a Child of God still: so they contend, not for *sinless*, but *sinful Perfection*: just as different from what I contend for, as Heaven is from Hell. What the *Donatists* were, I do not know. But I suspect, they were the real Christians of that age: and were, therefore, served by St. Augustine and his warm adherents, as the Methodists are now by their zealous adversaries. It is extremely easy to blacken: and could I give myself leave, I could paint the consequences of your doctrine, in at least as dark and odious colours, as you could paint mine.

10. The passage of St. Peter (mentioned Sermon XII.) I still think proves all which I brought it to prove.

"But you allow (Sermon IV.) that Paul and Barnabas did commit sin. And these were without all controversy Fathers in Christ." That is not without controversy: that either Barnabas when he left Paul, or Peter when he dissembled at Antioch, was at that time a father in Christ in St. John's sense: though *by office* undoubtedly they were. Their example, therefore, only proves what no one denies, viz. That if a Believer keeps not himself, he may commit sin. Would the conclusions here drawn, "be made only by a very weak Opponent?" Then you are a weak Opponent; for you make them all, either from these or other premises. For you believe and maintain, 1. That *all the other Apostles committed sin sometimes*: 2. That *all the other Christians* of the Apostolic Age, sometimes committed sin: 3. That *all other Christians in all Ages*, do and will commit sin as long as they live: and, 4. That every man *must* commit sin, *cannot help* it, as long as he is in the body. You cannot deny one of the Propositions, if you understand your own Premises.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Your affectionate Brother,

J. WESLEY.

OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

THE proofs of the Immortality of the Soul are drawn, 1st, From the nature of the soul itself, and particularly its immateriality; which though not absolutely necessary to the eternity of its duration, has, I think, been evinced to almost a demonstration.

2dly, From its passions and sentiments, as particularly from its love of existence, its horror of annihilation, and its hopes of immortality, with that sweet satisfaction which it finds in the practice of virtue, and that uneasiness which follows in it upon the commission of vice.

3dly, From the nature of the Supreme Being, whose justice, goodness, wisdom, and veracity, are all concerned in this point.

But among these and other excellent arguments for the immortality of the soul, there is one drawn from the perpetual progress of the soul to its perfection, without a possibility of ever arriving at it; which is a hint that I do not remember to have seen opened and improved by others who have written on this subject, though it seems to me to carry a great weight with it. How can it enter into the thoughts of man, that the soul, which is capable of such immense perfections, and of receiving new improvements to all eternity, shall fall away into nothing almost as soon as it is created? Are such abilities made for no purpose? A brute arrives at a point of perfection that he can never pass; in a few years he has all the endowments he is capable of; and were he to live ten thousand more, would be the same thing he is at present. Were a human soul thus at a stand in her accomplishments, were her faculties to be full grown, and incapable of farther enlargements, I could imagine it might fall away insensibly, and drop at once into a state of

annihilation. But can we believe a thinking being, that is in a perpetual progress of improvements, and travelling on from perfection to perfection, after having just looked abroad into the works of its Creator, and made a few discoveries of his infinite goodness, wisdom, and power, must perish at her first setting out, and in the very beginning of her inquiries?

A man considered in his present state, seems only sent into the world to propagate his kind. He provides himself with a successor, and immediately quits his post to make room for him.

——————————*Hæres*
Hæredem alterius, velut unda supervenit undam.

Hor. Ep. 2. l. 2. v. 175.

——Heir crowds on heir, as in a rolling flood
Wave urges wave. CREECH.

He does not seem born to enjoy life, but to deliver it down to others. This is not surprising to consider in animals, which are formed for our use, and can finish their business in a short life. The silk-worm, after having spun her task, lays her eggs and dies. But a man can never have taken in his full measure of knowledge, has not time to subdue his passions, establish his soul in virtue, and come up to the perfection of his nature, before he is hurried off the stage. Would an infinitely wise Being make such glorious beings for so mean a purpose? Can he delight in the production of such abortive intelligences, such short-lived reasonable beings? Would he give us talents that are not to be exerted? Capacities that are never to be gratified? How can we find that wisdom that shines through all his works, in the formation of man, without looking on this world as only a nursery for the next, and believing that the several generations of rational creatures, which rise up and disappear in such quick successions are only to receive their first rudiments of existence here, and afterwards to be transplanted into a more friendly climate, where they may spread and flourish to all eternity.

There is not a more pleasing and triumphant consideration in religion than this, of the perpetual progress which the soul makes towards the perfection of its nature, without ever arriving at a period in it. To look upon the soul as going on from strength to strength; to consider that she is to shine for ever with new accessions of glory, and brighten to all eternity; that she will be still adding virtue to virtue, and knowledge to knowledge; carries in it something wonderfully agreeable to that ambition which is natural to the mind of man. Nay, it must be a prospect pleasing to God himself, to see his creation for ever beautifying in his eyes, and drawing nearer to him, by greater degrees of resemblance.

Methinks this single consideration, of the progress of a finite spirit to perfection, will be sufficient to extinguish all envy in inferior natures, and all contempt in superior. That cherub that now appears as a god to a human soul, knows that a period will come, when the human soul shall be as perfect as he himself now is: nay, when she shall look down upon that degree of perfection, as much as she now falls short of it. It is true, the higher nature still advances, and preserves his distance, and superiority in the scale of being; but he knows that, how high soever the station is of which he stands prepossessed at present, the inferior nature will at length mount up to it, and shine forth in the same degree of glory.

With what astonishment and veneration may we look into our souls, where there are such hidden stores of virtue and knowledge! Such inexhausted sources of perfection! We know not yet what we shall be, nor will it ever enter into the heart of man to conceive the glory that will be always in reserve for him. The soul, considered with its Creator, is like one of those mathematical lines that may draw near to another to all eternity, without a possibility of touching it. And can there be a thought so transporting as to consider ourselves in these perpetual approaches to him, who is not only the standard of perfection, but of happiness!

A THOUGHT UPON MARRIAGE.

If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

1. I AM not now about to speak to men of the world, or to them that have only the form of Religion; but to you who *have* experienced, if you do not *now*, the *faith which worketh by love*. And in speaking to *you* I do not peremptorily assert any thing. I barely propose a thought that rises in my mind, and beg you to consider it.

2. You have some thoughts of altering your condition: and we know, *Marriage is honourable to all men*. But is your eye single herein? This is worthy your most serious consideration. Retire a little into yourself, and ask your own heart, "What is it moves me to think of this?"

3. I will tell you how it was with *me*. Though I do not know I was ever low-spirited, (my spirits being always the same, whether in sickness or in health,) yet I was often uneasy. Even in vigorous health, in plenty, and in the midst of my friends, I wanted something: I was not satisfied. I looked about for happiness, but could not find it. Then I thought, "O, if I had but such a person with me, I should surely be happy." I mused with myself, "How lovely is her look! How agreeably she talks? I thought of Sappho's words:

"Blest as th' immortal gods is he,
The youth that fondly sits by thee;
And hears and sees thee all the while,
Softly speak and sweetly smile."

Surely this is the very thing I want; and could I attain it, I should then no more be solitary! For,

"Thou from all shades the darkness wouldst exclude,
And from a desert banish solitude:"

Therefore with her, I can be happy: without her, I never can."

4. Perhaps your case is something like mine. Let me then ask you a few questions.

Were you ever convinced of sin? Of your lost, undone state? Did you feel the wrath of God abiding on you? If so, what did you then want to make you happy? "To know my God is reconciled." You had your wish. You were enabled to say boldly, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." And were not you then happy? "Indeed I was." In what? "In the knowledge and love of God."

5. And if you now have the same knowledge and love of God, does it not answer the same end? Will not the same cause still produce the same effect? If therefore you are not happy now, is it not because you have not that intercourse with God, which you then had? And you are seeking to supply the want of that intercourse, by the enjoyment of a creature! You imagine that near connexion with a woman will make amends for distance from God! Have you so learned Christ? Has your experience taught you no better than this?

6. You *were* happy once: you knew you were: happy in God, without being beholden to any creature. You did not need

Love's all-sufficient sea to raise
With drops of creature-happiness.

And is it wise to seek it now any where else, than where you found it before? You have not the same excuse with those who were never happy in God. And how little is the seeking it in any creature better than idolatry? Is it not, in effect, loving the creature more than the Creator? Does it not imply that you are *a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God?*

7. O return to Him that made you happy before, and He will make you happy again. Repeat your prayer,

Keep me dead to all below;
Only Christ resolv'd to know:
Firm, and disengag'd, and free;
Seeking all my bliss in thee!

Seek, accept of nothing in the room of God. Let all the springs of your happiness be in him. *Seek first*, just as you did before, *the kingdom of God and his righteousness:* the

knowledge and love of God; *fellowship with the Father and with his Son* Jesus Christ: *and all other things shall be added unto you:* particularly joy in the Holy Ghost. Again,

Know God, and teach thy soul to know
The joys that from Religion flow:
Then ev'ry grace shall be thy guest;
And peace be there to crown the rest!

Lisburn, June 11, 1785.

THOUGHTS UPON DISSIPATION.

1. PERHAPS nothing can be more seasonable at the present time, than to bestow a few thoughts on this. It is a fashionable subject, very frequently spoken of, especially in good company. An ingenious writer has lately given us an Essay upon the subject. When it fell into my hands a few days since, I was filled with a pleasing expectation of seeing it thoroughly explained. But my expectation was not answered: for although many just and lively things are said there, yet in above twenty pages I could find no definition of *Dissipation*, either bad or good.

2. But "the love of dissipation," says the Author, "is the reigning evil of the present day." Allowing it is; I ask, What do you mean by dissipation? Sometimes you use the word *pleasure* as an equivalent term. But what pleasure do you mean? The pleasures of sense, or of the imagination in general? Or any particular pleasure of one or the other? At other times you seem to make dissipation the same with luxury; at least with a high degree of it. Sometimes again you use "the love of amusement," as the same with "love of dissipation." But the question recurs, What amusement do you mean? For there are numberless sorts. So that still, after talking about them so long we have only a vague, indeterminate notion of a dissipated age, a dissipated nation, or a dissipated man;

without having any clear or distinct idea, what the word *dissipation* means!

3. Those who are content with slight and superficial views of things, may rest in the general account, that a *dissipated age* is one, wherein the bulk of mankind, especially those of any rank or fashion, spend the main of their time in eating and drinking, and diversions, and the other pleasures of sense and imagination. And that we live in a dissipated age, in this meaning of the word, is as plain as that the sun shines at noon day. Most of those that are commonly termed *innocent amusements*, fall under this head, the Pleasures of Imagination. Whenever, therefore, a general fondness of these prevail, that is a *dissipated age*. A *dissipated* nation is one, where the people in general are vehemently attached to the pleasures of sense and imagination. The smaller vulgar in England are at present passionately fond of the lowest pleasures both of sense and fancy: while the great vulgar are equally engrossed by those they account a higher kind. Mean time they are all equally dissipated, although in different ways. And so indeed is every man and woman, that is passionately attached to external pleasure.

4. But without dwelling any longer on the surface of things, let us search the matter to the bottom, and inquire, Wherein lies the original ground of *human dissipation?* Let this be once pointed out, and it will place the whole question in the clearest light.

5. Man is an immortal spirit, created in the image, and for the enjoyment of God. This is the one, the only end of his being; he exists for no other purpose. God is the centre of all spirits; and while they cleave to him, they are wise, holy, and happy: but in the same proportion as they are separated from him, they are foolish, unholy, and unhappy. This disunion from God is the very essence of human dissipation: which is no other than the scattering the thoughts and affections from the Creator to the creature. Wherefore fondness for sensual enjoyments of any kind, love of silly, irrational pleasures, love of trifling amuse-

ments, luxury, vanity, and a thousand foolish desires and tempers, are not so properly dissipation itself, as they are the fruits of it, the natural effects of being unhinged from the Creator, the Father, the Centre of all intelligent spirits.

6. It is this against which the Apostle guards in his advice to the Christians at Corinth; *This I speak, that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.* It might as well be rendered, *without dissipation*, without having your thoughts any way scattered from God. The having our thoughts and affections centred in God, this is *Christian simplicity*. The having them in any degree uncentred from God, this is *dissipation*. And it little differs in the real nature of things, and in the eye of God, the Judge of all, whether a man be kept in a state of dissipation from God, by crowns, and empires, and thousands of gold and silver, or by cards, and dancing, and drinking, and dressing, and mistressing, and masquerades, and picking straws.

7. Dissipation is then, in the very root of it, separation from God: in other words, Atheism, or the being without God in the world. It is the negative branch of Ungodliness. And in this true sense of the word, certainly England is the most dissipated nation that is to be found under heaven. And whether our thoughts and affections are dissipated, scattered from God, by women, or food, or dress, or one or ten thousand petty trifles, that dissipation (innocent as it may seem) is equally subversive of all real virtue and all real happiness. It carries its own punishment: though we are loaded with blessings, it often makes our very existence a burden: and by an unaccountable anxiety gives a foretaste of what it is to be *punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord!*

Hilton Park, March 26, 1783.

A CLEAR AND CONCISE DEMONSTRATION OF THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THERE are four grand and powerful arguments which strongly induce us to believe that the Bible must be from God, viz. miracles, prophecies, the goodness of the doctrine, and the moral character of the penmen. All the miracles flow from Divine Power; all the prophecies from Divine Understanding; the goodness of the doctrine from Divine Goodness; and the moral character of the penmen from Divine Holiness.

Thus Christianity is built upon four grand pillars, viz. the Power, Understanding, Goodness, and Holiness of God: Divine Power is the source of all the miracles; Divine Understanding of all the prophecies; Divine Goodness of the goodness of the doctrine; and Divine Holiness of the moral character of the penmen.

I beg leave to propose a short, clear, and strong argument to prove the Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.

The Bible must be the invention either of good men or angels, bad men or devils, or of God.

1. It could not be the invention of good men or angels, for they neither would nor could make a book and tell lies all the time they were writing it, saying, Thus saith the Lord, when it was their own invention.

2. It could not be the invention of bad men or devils, for they would not make a book which commands all duty, forbids all sin, and condemns their own souls to hell to all eternity.

3. Therefore I draw this conclusion, That the Bible must be given by Divine Inspiration.

SOME THOUGHTS ON AN EXPRESSION OF ST. PAUL, IN THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS, CHAP. V. VER. 23.

1. THE words, as literally translated as the English tongue will bear, run thus: *May the whole of you, the spirit, and the soul, and the body, be preserved blameless.*

What does St. Paul here mean, by dividing man into three parts, *the spirit, and the soul, and the body?*

This creates what has been thought an insurmountable difficulty, by those who argue thus:

"How is it possible to contradistinguish the Soul, both from the Spirit and from the Body? For it must be either material or immaterial, matter or not matter: there is no medium. But if it be matter, does it not coincide with *the body?* If it be not matter, does it not coincide with *the spirit?*"

But perhaps a way may be found of untying this knot, of unravelling this difficulty, by simply declaring the (at least probable) meaning of these three terms.

May not *the Spirit* mean (so it has been understood by the Christians in all ages) the highest principle in man, the immortal Spirit made in the image of God, endued (as all Spirits are, so far as we can conceive) with self-motion, understanding, will, and liberty?

Is not *the Body*, that portion of organized matter, which every man receives in the womb, with which he is born into the world, and which he carries with him to the grave? At present it is connected with flesh and blood. But these are not the Body. They are only the temporary clothing of the body, which it wholly puts off in the grave.

The Soul seems to be the immediate clothing of the Spirit, the vehicle with which it is connected from its first existence, and which is never separated from it, either in life or in death. Probably it consists of ethereal or elec-

tric fire, the purest of all matter. It does not seem to be affected by the death of the body, but envelopes the separate, as it does the embodied spirit: neither will it undergo any essential change, when it is *clothed upon* with the immortal body at the resurrection.

May not the apostle have an eye to this, in those remarkable words, (2 Cor. v. 4,) *We that are in this tabernacle* (this corruptible flesh and blood) *do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed,* (divested of all covering, which belongs only to the Father of Spirits,) *but clothed upon* with the glorious resurrection-body, covering both our soul and spirit. This will *swallow up,* totally destroy τὸ θνητὸν· *that which was mortal,* namely, the flesh and blood, which alone was liable to death.

If we understood the words of the apostle in this sense, all the difficulty vanishes away. We allow, there can be no medium between material and immaterial. But still there is room for a wide and essential difference, between the soul and the body: the latter implying that original portion of matter which is now clothed with flesh and blood: the former, that vehicle of ethereal fire, which immediately covers the immortal spirit.

CONGLETON, *March* 31, 1786.

THOUGHTS ON SUICIDE.

IT is a melancholy consideration, that there is no country in Europe, or perhaps in the habitable world, where the horrid crime of self-murder is so common as it is in *England!* One reason of this may be, that the English, in general, are more ungodly and more impatient than other nations. Indeed we have laws against it, and officers with juries are appointed, to inquire into every fact of the kind. And

these are to give in their verdict upon oath, whether the self-murderer was sane or insane? If he is brought in insane, he is excused, and the law does not affect him. By this means it is totally eluded; for the juries constantly bring him in insane. So the law is not of the least effect, though the farce of a trial still continues.

This morning I asked a coroner, "Sir, did you ever know a jury bring in the deceased *Felo-de-se?*" He answered, "No, Sir: and it is a pity they should." What then is the law good for? If all self-murderers are mad, what need of any trial concerning them?

But it is plain our ancestors did not think so, or those laws had never been made. It is true, every self-murderer is mad in some sense, but not in that sense which the law intends. This fact does not prove him mad in the eye of the law: the question is, was he mad in other respects? If not, every juror is perjured who does not bring him in *Felo-de-se.*

But how can this vile abuse of the law be prevented, and this execrable crime effectually discouraged?

By a very easy method. We read in ancient history, that at a certain period, many of the women in Sparta murdered themselves. This fury increasing, a law was made, that the body of every woman that killed herself, should be exposed naked in the streets. The fury ceased at once.

Only let a law be made and rigorously executed, That the body of every self-murderer, lord or peasant, shall be hanged in chains, and the *English* fury will cease at once.

LIVERPOOL, *April* 8, 1790.

THOUGHTS UPON TASTE.

1. A FEW weeks ago I read with care and attention, a celebrated *Essay on Taste.* I cannot say, but I entered upon it with great expectation, as I knew the author to be

*

a man of understanding, and one whose natural abilities were improved by a considerable share of learning. I knew likewise that the performance itself had been highly and generally applauded: yea, that the Doctor had been honoured with the medal, which is yearly given by the Society, to him that produces the best performance on the subject proposed.

2. Yet to speak the plain truth, I cannot affirm, that it altogether answered my expectation. It did not appear to me, to be written upon a good plan, neither to be well digested. And there are assertions almost in every chapter, which are exceedingly disputable. Many of these I could not clearly assert: some of them I utterly deny. Neither could I find in the whole tract, any clear, just definition of the subject. So that after all he has said, one would still be puzzled to answer the question, "What is Taste?"

3. But is there any better book upon the subject extant? I do not conceive there is. At least I have not seen it: although there are some ingenious thoughts of Mr. Addison upon it in the Spectator. And nearly related to this, is his fine "Essay on the Pleasures of Imagination." But *Taste* is a more extensive word. It does not relate to the imagination only.

4. It may be the more difficult to understand the precise meaning of the word, because there are so few words that are synonymous to it. I do not recollect any, either in Greek or Latin; no, nor yet in the English language. Indeed we have some which are generally supposed to be nearly equivalent with it. So a man of *taste* is almost the same with a man of *genius*, a man of *sense*, or a man of *judgment*: but none of these mean exactly the same thing.

5. "Most languages," says Mr. Addison, "make use of this metaphor to express that faculty of mind which distinguishes the most concealed faults and nicest perfections in writings." But this definition is far too narrow. For taste refers to other things, as well as writings. And when he adds, It "is that faculty of the soul, which discovers the beauties of an author with pleasure, and his imperfections

with dislike:" this is too narrow still: for Taste is concerned with many things beside authors.

6. What then is *Taste*, in the general meaning of the word? It is certainly a faculty of the mind, analagous to the sense of taste. By the external sense we *relish* various foods, and *distinguish* one from the other. By the internal, we *relish* and *distinguish* from each other various foods offered to the mind. Taste is, therefore, that internal sense, which relishes and distinguishes its proper object. By *relishes*, I mean, *perceives with pleasure*: for in the common acceptation of the word, we are not said, to have a taste for displeasing, but only for pleasing objects. And as various as those objects are, so various are the species of Taste.

7. Some of these are objects of the understanding. Such are all speculative truths; particularly those of a metaphysical or mathematical nature. So we say, a man has a *taste* for metaphysics; which is more than to say, He has *judgment* therein. It implies over and above, that he has a *relish* for them; that he finds a sweetness in the study of them. And when we say, a man has a *taste* for the mathematics, we mean by that expression, not only that he is capable of understanding them, but that he takes pleasure therein.

8. Another species of Taste, is that which relates to the objects that gratify the imagination. Thus we are accustomed to say, a man has a *taste* for grandeur, for novelty, or for beauty: meaning thereby, that he takes pleasure in grand, in new, or in beautiful objects, whether they are such by nature or by art. And herein there is an unbounded variety. I mean, in the different tastes of men: some having a taste for grandeur, some for beauty. Some again have a taste for one kind of beauty: and others for another. Some have a taste for the beauties of nature; others for those of art. The former for flowers, meadows, fields, or woods; the latter for painting or poetry. But some have a taste both for the one and the other.

9. But is there not likewise a kind of internal sense, whereby we relish the happiness of our fellow-creatures,

even without any reflection on our own interest, without any reference to ourselves? Whereby we bear a part in the prosperity of others, and rejoice with them that rejoice? Surely there is something still in the human mind, in many, if not in all, (whether by nature, or from a higher principle,) which interests us in the welfare, not only of our relatives, our friends, and our neighbours, but of those who are at the greatest distance from us, whether in time or place. And the most generous minds have most of this taste for human happiness.

10. May we not likewise observe, that there is a *beauty* in virtue, in gratitude, and disinterested benevolence? And have not many at least a taste for this? Do they not discern and relish it, wherever they find it? Yea, does it not give them one of the most delicate pleasures, whereof the human mind is capable? Is not this taste of infinitely more value, than a taste for any or all the pleasures of imagination? And is not this pleasure infinitely more delicate than any that ever resulted, yea, or can result, from the utmost refinements of music, poetry, or painting?

11. As to Taste in general, internal as well as external Taste seems to belong to all mankind: although infinitely diversified, both as to the objects, and the degrees of it. When therefore we say, "A man has no taste," the words are not to be taken strictly, as if he had absolutely no taste at all, in any of the foregoing senses: seeing every man living has more or less, an internal, as well as external taste. But they are to be understood in a limited sense. He has *no taste*, suppose, for metaphysics: he has no discernment, and he has no pleasure in things of this abstracted nature. Another man has *no taste* for mathematics: he has neither pleasure nor judgment therein. Mean time the mathematician has *no taste* either for poetry or music. He does not discern, and he does not relish the beauties, either of one or the other. But every one of these has some internal taste, how dull soever it be.

12. A *dull Taste* is properly one that is faint and languid, that has no lively perception of its object. But sometimes,

by a man of a dull taste, we mean one that relishes dull things: suppose dull, low compositions in music or poetry, or coarse and worthless pictures. But this is more properly termed a *bad taste*. So one is hugely pleased with the daubing of a sign-post, another, with doggerel verses, and a third, with the heavenly music of a pair of bag-pipes! Almost every town and every village supplies us with instances of the same kind. We sometimes call this a *false taste*, as it supposes things to be excellent which are not. In many it is natural: they have had this wrong turn ever since they were born. But in others it is gradually acquired, either by reading or conversation. Then we term it a *vitiated taste:* of this, too, there are abundant instances.

13. On the other hand, he has a *good*, a *just*, or a *true taste*, which discerns and relishes whatever, either in the works of nature or of art, is truly excellent in its kind. This is sometimes termed a *correct taste:* especially when it is delighted more or less, according to the greater or smaller degree of excellence that is in the object. This differs very little, if at all, from a *fine taste:* especially as Mr. Addison defines it, "That faculty of the mind which discerns with pleasure all the beauties of writing:" should it not be rather, "Which discerns all that is grand or beautiful, in the works both of art and nature?"

14. Such a Taste as this is much to be desired: and that on many accounts. It greatly increases those pleasures of life, which are not only innocent but useful. It qualifies us to be of far greater service to our fellow-creatures. It is more especially desirable for those whose profession calls them to converse with many: seeing it enables them to be more agreeable, and consequently more profitable in conversation.

15. But how shall a man know, whether he is possessed of this faculty or not? Let him, says Mr. Addison, "Read over the celebrated worksof antiquity," (to know whether he has a taste for fine writing,) "which have stood the test for so many ages and countries: or those works among the moderns, which have the sanction of the politer part of our

contemporaries. If, upon the perusal of such writings, he does not find himself delighted in an extraordinary manner, or if, upon reading the admired passages in such authors, he finds a coldness and indifference in his thoughts, he ought to conclude, not (as is most common among tasteless readers,) that the author wants those perfections, which have been admired in them, but that he himself wants the faculty of discerning them."

16. But how can a man acquire this taste? It "must in some degree be born with us: as it often happens, that those who have other qualities in perfection, are wholly void of this. But though it may, in some measure, be born with us, there are several means of improving it, without which it will be very imperfect and of little use to the person that possesses it. The most natural means is, to be conversant with the writings of the best authors. One that has any taste, either discovers new beauties, or receives stronger impressions from the masterly strokes of a great author, every time he peruses him."

17. "Conversation with men of genius is another means of improving our natural taste. It is impossible for a man of the greatest parts, to consider any thing in its whole extent. Every man, beside general observations upon an author, forms some that are peculiar to his own way of thinking. So that conversation will naturally furnish us with hints which we did not attend to, and make us enjoy other men's parts and reflections as well as our own." Besides, if we converse freely with men of taste, and incite them to "open the window in their breast," we may learn to correct whatever is yet amiss in our taste, as well as to supply whatever we or they perceive to be still wanting: all which may be directed to that glorious end, The *pleasing all men, for their good, unto edification.*

THOUGHTS ON THE POWER OF MUSIC.

1. BY the *Power of Music*, I mean, its power to affect the hearers; to raise various passions in the human mind. Of this we have very surprising accounts in ancient history. We are told, the ancient Greek musicians in particular, were able to excite whatever passions they pleased: to inspire love or hate, joy or sorrow, hope or fear, courage, fury, or despair: yea, to raise these one after another, and to vary the passion, just according to the variation of the music.

2. But how is this to be accounted for? No such effects attend the modern music: although it is confessed on all hands, that our instruments excel theirs beyond all degrees of comparison. What was their lyre, their instruments of seven or ten strings, compared to our violin? What were any of their pipes, to our hautboy or German flute? What all of them put together, all that were in use two or three thousand years ago, to our organ? How is it then, that with this inconceivable advantage, the modern music has less power than the ancient?

3. Some have given a very short answer to this, cutting the knot which they could not untie. They have doubted, or affected to doubt the fact: perhaps have even denied it. But no sensible man will do this, unless he be utterly blinded by prejudice. For it would be denying the faith of all history: seeing no fact is better authenticated. None is delivered down to us by more unquestionable testimony; such as fully satisfies in all other cases. We have, therefore, no more reason to doubt of the power of Timotheus' music, than that of Alexander's arms: and we may deny his taking Persepolis, as well as his burning it through that sudden rage, which was excited in him by that musician. And the various effects which were successively wrought in his mind, (so beautifully described by Dryden, in his Ode

on Cecilia's-day,) are astonishing instances of the power of a single harp, to transport, as it were, the mind out of itself.

4. Nay, we read of an instance, even in modern history, of the power of music not inferior to this. A musician being brought to the King of Denmark, and asked, whether he could excite any passion, answered in the affirmative, and was commanded to make the trial upon the King himself. Presently the monarch was all in tears; and upon the musician's changing his mood, he was quickly roused into such fury, that snatching a sword from one of his assistant's hands, (for they had purposely removed his own,) he immediately killed him, and would have killed all in the room, had he not been forcibly withheld.

5. This alone removes all the incredibility of what is related concerning the ancient music. But why is it that modern music, in general, has no such effect on the hearers? The grand reason seems to be no other than this: the whole nature and design of music is altered. The ancient composers studied *Melody* alone: the due arrangement of single notes: and it was by melody alone, that they wrought such wonderful effects. And as this music was directly calculated to move the passions, so they *designed* it for this very end. But the modern composers study *Harmony*, which in the present sense of the word is quite another thing, namely, a contrast of various notes, opposite to, and yet blendid with each other, wherein they,

"Now high, now low, pursue the resonant fugue."

Dr. Gregory says, this *Harmony* has been known in the world little more than two hundred years. Be that as it may, ever since it was introduced, ever since *counterpoint* has been invented, as it has altered the grand design of music, so it has well nigh destroyed its effects.

6. Some indeed have imagined, and attempted to prove, that the ancients were acquainted with this. It seems, there needs but one single argument, to demonstrate the contrary. We have many capital pieces of ancient music, that are now in the hands of the curious. Dr. Pepusch, who was well versed in the music of antiquity, (perhaps

the best of any man in Europe,) shewed me several large Greek folios which contained many of their musical compositions. Now is there, or is there not, any *counterpoint* in these? The learned know, there is no such thing. There is not the least trace of it to be found: it is all *Melody*, and no *Harmony*.

7. And as the *nature* of music is thus changed, so is likewise the *design* of it. Our composers do not aim at moving the passions, but at quite another thing: at varying and contrasting the notes, a thousand different ways. What has *counterpoint* to do with the passions? It is applied to a quite different faculty of the mind: not to our joy, or hope, or fear; but merely to the ear, to the imagination, or internal sense. And the pleasure it gives, is not upon this principle; not by raising any passion whatever. It no more affects the passions, than the judgment: both the one and the other lie quite out of its province.

8. Need we any other, and can we have any stronger proof of this, than those modern overtures, voluntaries, or concertos, which consist altogether of artificial sounds, without any words at all? What have any of the passions to do with these: What has judgment, reason, common sense? Just nothing at all. All these are utterly excluded, by delicate, unmeaning sound!

9. In this respect the modern music has no connexion with common sense, any more than with the passions. In another it is glaringly, undeniably contrary to common sense: namely, in allowing, nay, appointing different words, to be sung by different persons at the same time! What can be more shocking to a man of understanding than this? Pray which of those sentences am I to attend to? I can attend to only one sentence at once: and I hear three or four at one and the same instant! And, to complete the matter, this astonishing jargon has found a place even in the worship of God! It runs through (O pity! O shame!) the greatest part, even of our Church music! It is found even in the finest of our anthems, and in the most solemn parts of our public worship! Let any impartial, any un-

prejudiced person say, whether there can be a more direct mockery of God!

10. But to return. Is it strange, that modern music does not answer the end it is not designed for? And which it is in no wise calculated for? It is not possible it should. Had Timotheus' "pursued the resonant fugue," his music would have been quite harmless. It would have affected Alexander no more than Bucephalus: the finest city then in the world had not been destroyed: but

Persepolis stares, Cyrique arx alta manetes.

11. It is true, the modern music has been sometimes observed, to have as powerful an effect as the ancient: so that frequently, single persons, and sometimes numerous assemblies have been seen in a flood of tears. But when was this? Generally, if not always, when a fine solo was sung: when "the sound has been an echo to the sense:" when the music has been extremely simple and inartificial, the composer having attended to *Melody*, not *Harmony*. Then, and then only, the natural power of Music to move the passions has appeared. This music was calculated for that end, and effectually answered it.

12. Upon this ground it is, that so many persons are so much affected by *Scotch* or *Irish* airs. They are composed, not according to art but nature: they are simple in the highest degree. There is no *Harmony*, according to the present sense of the word, therein; but there is much *Melody*. And this is not only heard, but *felt* by all those, who retain their native taste: whose taste is not biassed, (I might say, corrupted,) by attending to *counterpoint* and complicated music. It is this, it is *counterpoint*, it is *Harmony* (so called) which destroys the power of our music. And if ever this should be banished from our composition, if ever we should return to the simplicity and melody of the ancients, then the effects of our music will be as surprising as any that were wrought by theirs: yea, perhaps they will be as much greater, as modern instruments are more excellent than those of the ancients.

INVERNESS, *June* 9, 1779.

THOUGHTS UPON JACOB BEHMEN.

I HAVE considered the Memoirs of Jacob Behmen, of which I will speak very freely.

I believe he was a good man. But I see nothing extraordinary either in his life or in his death. I have known many, both men and women, who were far more exemplary in their lives, and far more honoured of God in their deaths.

I allow he wrote many truths: but none that would have appeared at all extraordinary, had he thrown aside his hard words, and used plain and common language.

What some seem most to admire in his writings, is what I most object to: I mean his philosophy, and his phraseology. These are really *his own:* and they are quite *new:* therefore they are quite wrong.

I totally object to his blending Religion with Philosophy; and as vain a Philosophy as ever existed: crude, indigested; supported neither by Scripture nor Reason: nor any thing but his own *ipse dixit.*

I grant, Mr. Law, by taking immense pains, has licked it into some shape. And he has made it hang tolerably together. But still it admits of no manner of proof.

And all he writes concerning Religion is what very many have said before him; and in a far better manner.

To his whole Scheme I object,

1. The whole foundation of it is wrong: the very attempt to explain Religion, which is the most simple thing in the world, by an abstruse, complicated, philosophical theory, is the most absurd thing that can be conceived.

I pray, consider but one argument against it. Either St. Paul and St. John knew this theory, or they did not. Mr. Law supposes they did not know it; but that Jacob knew more than they both. I verily think, this needs no confutation. Let him believe it that can. But if they did know it, how did they dare to conceal any part of the counsel of God?

Upon the theory itself I shall only repeat a very little of

what I observed in my printed Letter to Mr. Law, p. 8, &c.

"All that can be conceived," (says Mr. Law, quoting from Jacob,) "is *God*, or *Nature*, or *Creature*."

Is *Nature* created or not created? It must be one or the other; for there is no medium. If not created, it is God. If created, is it not a creature? How then can there be three, *God*, *Nature*, and *Creature?* Since Nature must coincide either with God or Creature.

"*Nature* is in itself a *hungry*, *wrathful fire of life*. *Nature* is and can be only a *Desire*. *Desire* is the very *Being* of *Nature*." "*Nature* is only a *Desire*, because it is for the sake of *something else!* *Nature* is only a *Torment*: because it cannot help itself to what it wants."

Shame to human understanding! That any man should fall in love with such stark, staring nonsense as this!

"*Nature*, as well as God, is antecedent to all Creature. There is an *eternal Nature*, as universal and as *unlimited* as God." Is then Nature God? Or, are there two *Eternal*, *Universal*, *Infinite Beings?*

"Nothing is *before Eternal Nature*, but God." Nothing but! Is any thing before that which is Eternal?

"*Nature*, and *Darkness*, and *Self*, are but three different expressions for one and the same thing. Nature has *all Evil* and *no Evil* in it."

"*Nature* has seven *chief Properties*, and can have neither more nor less, because it is a *Birth from the Deity in Nature*." (Is *Nature a Birth from the Deity in Nature?* Is not this a flat contradiction?) "For God is triune, and Nature is triune:" (Nature triune! Prove it who can.) "And hence arise Properties, three and three:" Why not four and four? "And that which brings three and three into union, is another property." Sublime jargon!

"The three first properties of Nature are the *whole essence* of that *Desire*, which is, and is called *Nature*." A *part* of its properties are the *whole essence* of it! Flat contradiction again!

"The three first Properties of Nature are, *Attraction*,

Resistance, and *Whirling*. In these three Properties of the *Desire*, you see the reason of the three great laws of Matter and Motion."

How does it appear, that these are any of the Properties of *Nature*, if you mean by *Nature* any thing distinct from *Matter*? And how are they Properties of *Desire*?

"The fourth Property is *Fire*: the fifth, the form of Light and Love:" (what is the *form of Love*? And are Light and Love the same thing?) "The sixth, Sound or Understanding," (the same thing doubtless!) "The seventh, *a Life of triumphing Joy*." Is then *a Life of triumphing Joy*, "that which brings the three and three Properties into union?" If so, how is it, "the *result* of that union?"

Once more. "*Attraction* is an incessant working of three contrary Properties, *Drawing*, *Resisting*, and *Whirling*." That is, in plain terms, "*Drawing* is incessant Drawing, Resistance, and Whirling."

Such is the *Philosophy* which Jacob received by *immediate Inspiration!* (to mention only the first Principles of it.) And by which he is to explain all Religion, and the whole Revelation of God!

I. As to his Divinity, I object, first, to the very design of explaining Religion by any Philosophy whatever. The Scripture gives us no direction, no, nor any permission so to do. I object much more, to the execution of his design: the attempting to explain it by that base, unmeaning, self-contradictory jargon, which is as far remote from all true, genuine Philosophy, as it is from the Scripture itself.

II. But be the foundation as it may, he builds no superstructure upon it, but what we knew before, either with regard to internal or external Holiness. We knew before, "Neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith that worketh by Love." And what does he teach us by all his hard, uncouth words, more than this plain truth?

We knew before, that we "must be born again;" inwardly changed from all evil tempers to all good; from an

"earthly, sensual, devilish mind," to "the mind that was in Christ Jesus." And what more does he teach us on this head, by all his vain, precarious mystical Philosophy?

We knew before, that "the loving God with all our heart," and "the loving our neighbour as ourselves," is "the fulfilling of the law," the "end of the commandment," the sum of all Religion. And what has he told us more than this, in all his nineteen volumes?

We knew before, that the whole of Religion is, a heart and life totally devoted to God. Has he told us, or can he tell us any thing more? No, nor all the angels in heaven.

We knew before, that the *foundation* and the *superstructure* of Religion are comprised in those words, "We love him, because he first loved us." Does he teach us any thing higher or deeper? In a word, Does he teach any single point, either of inward or outward holiness, which we did not know before? If he does, what is it? I cannot find out one in all his writings.

III. But if his matter is not new, if this is nothing uncommon, his manner of speaking is new indeed! His language is utterly new: it was never used since the world began. And this is the very reason, for which he is so admired. Because he *speaks* (which cannot be denied) as never man spake. Indeed I hardly know, for which he is most admired, the *novelty*, or the *obscurity* of his *language*.

But I cannot admire it at all: because it is quite unscriptural. There is no trace of it to be found in any part either of the Old or New Testament. Therefore I cannot reconcile it to that express command, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."

I cannot admire it, because, secondly, it is *barbarous* in the highest degree; whatever is peculiar in his phraseology, is not authorized by any good writer whatever. It is queerness itself. It is mere dog-latin. It is an insult upon the ear and the understanding of all mankind.

One allows, "None can understand it without much pains; perhaps not without reading him thrice over." I

would not read him thrice over on any consideration. 1. Because it would be enough to crack any man's brain to brood so long over such unintelligible nonsense: and, 2. Because such a waste of time, might provoke God to give me up to a strong delusion, to believe a lie.

But I doubt, whether any man understands it at all. For it is so dark and indeterminate, that I have not found any two persons in England, who understand it alike. I thought, if any man living understood Behmen, Mr. Law did. "No, (says one who has been studying him these forty years,) Mr. Law never understood a page of him."

IV. The whole of *Behmenism*, including both phrase and sense, is useless. It stuns and astonishes its admirers. It fills their heads; but it does not change their hearts. It makes no eminent Christians. For many years I have diligently inquired, concerning the grand patrons of it. And I have found none of them who were burning and shining Lights; none who adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour.

V. But it is not barely useless: it is *mischievous:* and that in a high degree. For it strikes at the root of both internal and external Religion, (suppose Mr. Law understood it,) by sapping the foundation of Justification by Faith. For Jacob affirms, "God was never angry at Sinners." But if so, he was never reconciled to them. His wrath was never turned away, if it never existed. And admitting this, there is no place for Justification: nor consequently, for faith in a pardoning God, which is the root of both inward and outward Holiness.

More particularly it strikes at the root of *humility*, tending to make men admire themselves, and despise others. Never was a more melancholy proof of this than Mr. Law, who seriously believed himself the most knowing man in the kingdom, and despised all that contradicted him, even in the tenderest manner, as the mire in the streets. It strikes at the root of *charity*, inspiring into its strictest votaries deep *censoriousness* toward the world in general, and an inexpressible *bitterness* toward all who do not receive

their new Apostle. This may be observed, in all the Authors of the Memoirs, though, in other respects, good men: and in all I have conversed with in my life who were thorough *Behmenists*.

Above all, it strikes at the root of *external Religion*, by destroying zeal for good works: by laying little stress on either works of Piety or Mercy, and still less, upon Christian Society: it particularly tends to make all men of sense and learning bury their talent in the earth, the natural effect of continually declaiming, in a loose and indiscriminate manner against reason and learning.

It strikes at the root of *all revealed Religion*, by making men think meanly of the Bible: a natural effect of thinking Behmen *more highly illuminated* than any or all of the Apostles. So Mr. S. frankly acknowledged, "While I admired him, I thought St. Paul and St. John very mean writers."

Indeed it quite spoils the *taste* for plain, simple Religion, such as that of the Bible is, and gives a false taste, which can relish nothing so well, as high, obscure, unintelligible jargon.

December 22, 1780.

THOUGHTS UPON BARON MONTESQUIEU'S SPIRIT OF LAWS.

1. AS some of my friends desire I would give them my thoughts on "The Spirit of Laws," I do it willingly, and in the plainest manner I can; that if I am wrong, I may be the sooner set right. I undertook the reading of it with huge expectation, hoping to find an invaluable treasure; as the Author is seldom spoken of, but as the Phœnix of the Age, a Prodigy of Understanding, and the book is

every where spoken of, as the highest effort of genius that ever was. Accordingly, as late as it has appeared in an English dress, it is already come to the eleventh edition. And who knows, but in a few years more, it may come to the two and twentieth?

2. Yet I cannot but observe, that in several places the Translator does not seem to understand the original: that there is in the last London edition, a great number of typographical errors: and that, not in a few places, either the translator or the printer has made absolute nonsense.

3. But whence is it, that such a multitude of people, so hugely admire, and highly applaud this treatise? Perhaps nine in ten of them do this, because others do: they follow the cry, without why or wherefore. They follow one another like a flock of sheep; they run on, because many run before them. It is quite the fashion: and who would be out of the fashion? As well be out of the world. Not that one half of these have read the book over; nor does one in ten of them understand it. But it is enough that "every one commends it. And why should not I too?" Especially, as he seems greatly to admire himself; and, upon occasion, to commend himself too: though in a modest, decent way; not in that fulsome manner, which is common among modern writers.

4. Others admire him because of his vast learning, testified by the numerous books he refers to: and yet others, because he is no bigot to Christianity, because he is a free and liberal thinker. I doubt whether many gentlemen do not admire him on this account, more than on all the others put together: and the rather, because he does not openly attack the religion of his country, but wraps up, in the most neat and decent language, the remarks which strike at the root of it.

5. But it cannot be denied, that he deserves our commendation upon several accounts. He has an extremely fine imagination, and no small degree of understanding. His style is lively: and even under the disadvantage of a translation, terse, and elegant. Add to this, that he has

many remarks, which I suppose are perfectly his own: at least, I never remember to have seen them, in any either ancient or modern Writer. Now when all these things are considered, is it any wonder that he should be received with so high and general applause?

6. "Why then do not you concur with the general voice? Why do not you pay him the same admiration?" Without any preface or apology, I will tell you my reasons. And then let you or any candid man, judge whether they are not sufficient.

I do not greatly admire him, 1. Because so large a part of his book, I believe little less than half of it, is dry, dull, unaffecting and unentertaining: at least to all but Frenchmen. What have I, or any Briton to do, with the petty changes in the French government? What have we to do with a long, tedious detail, of the old, obsolete feudal laws? Over and above, that we cannot find any use therein, that the knowledge of these things answers no one reasonable purpose, it touches none of the passions: it gives no pleasure, no entertainment to a thinking mind. It is heavy and tedious to the last degree. It is as insipid as the travels of Thomas Coryatt.

7. I do not admire him, 2. Because I think, he makes very many remarks that are not just, and because he gives us many assertions, which are not true. But all these he pronounces as *ex Cathedra*, with an air of infallibility: as though he were the dictator not only of France, but of Europe; as though he expected all men to bow before him.

8. But what I least of all admire is, his laying hold on every opportunity to depreciate the inspired Writers—Moses in particular. Indeed here his prudence and decency seem to fail him, and he speaks of the Jewish lawgiver with as little respect or reserve, as he would of Lycurgus, Romulus, or Numa Pompilius.

9. These are some of the reflections which readily occurred to me, from a cursory reading of this celebrated Author. I add but one more, What is the meaning of his

title-page? I am afraid of stumbling at the threshold. What does he mean by "The Spirit of Laws?" After reading the whole book, I really do not know. The words give me no idea at all. And the more I study, the less I comprehend them. The Author never defines them at all. I verily believe, he did not comprehend them himself. I believe he had no clear or determinate ideas affixed to those words. And was he not likely, when he set out with his head in a mist, to go on in a wonderful manner? Other talents he undoubtedly had: but two he wanted, Religion and Logic. Therefore he ought to be read warily by those who are not well grounded in both.

10. Upon the whole, I think Baron Montesquieu was wholly unworthy of the violent encomiums which have been bestowed upon him. I think he excelled in imagination, but not in judgment, any more than in solid learning. I think, in a word, that he was a child to Monsieur Pascal, Father Malebranche, or Mr. Locke.

THOUGHTS ON THE CHARACTER AND WRITINGS OF MR. PRIOR.

1. A VERY ingenious Writer has lately given us a particular account of the Character and Works of Mr. Prior. But it was not likely to be a just one, as he formed it chiefly on the testimony of very suspicious witnesses. I mean Mr. Pope, and Mr. Spence: I object both to one and the other. They depreciated him, to exalt themselves. They viewed him with no friendly eye; looking upon him, (particularly Mr. Pope,) as a rival: whom, therefore, they rejoiced to depress.

2. Mr. Pope gives it as his opinion, That "he was fit only to make verses." What can be more unjust? He

was fit for transactions of the most difficult and delicate nature. Accordingly he was entrusted with them at Paris, and acquitted himself to the full satisfaction of his employers. He was really fit for every thing; for writing either in verse or prose; for conversation, and for either public or private business.

3. But Mr. Spence says, "His life was irregular, negligent, and sensual. He descended to the meanest company. The woman with whom he cohabited was a despicable drab of the lowest species. One of his wenches, perhaps Chloe, stole his plate and ran away with it."

I do not believe one word of this: although I was often in his neighbourhood, I never heard a word of it before. It carries no face of probability. Would Bishop Atterbury have kept up an acquaintance with a man of such a character? Would that accomplished nobleman, the then Earl of Oxford, have given him a place even in his friendship? I am well assured, my eldest Brother would have had no acquaintance with him, had he been such a wretch as Mr. Spence describes.

4. Others say, "His Chloe was ideal." I know the contrary. I have heard my eldest Brother say, "Her name was Miss Taylor, that he knew her well: and that she once came to him (in Dean's Yard, Westminster,) purposely to ask his advice. She told him, "Sir, I know not what to do. Mr. Prior makes large professions of his love: but he never offers me marriage." My Brother advised her to bring the matter to a point at once. She went directly to Mr. Prior, and asked him plainly, "Do you intend to marry me, or not?" He said many soft and pretty things: on which she said, "Sir, in refusing to answer, you *do* answer. I will see you no more." And she did see him no more to the day of his death. But afterwards she spent many hours, standing and weeping at his tomb in Westminster Abbey.

5. As to his Writings, I cannot but think Mr. Prior had not only more learning, but a stronger natural understanding, than Mr. Pope. But this is the less observable, be-

cause Mr. Prior always wrote, *currente calamo*, having little time to correct any thing. Whereas Mr. Pope laboured every line, and polished it with the utmost exactness. Prior's praise is by no means "that of correctness." He has many unpolished, hasty, half-formed lines, which he would not (or did not) take the pains to correct. I can, therefore, by no means subscribe to that sentence, "What he obtains above mediocrity, seems to be the effort of struggle and travail." Surely not. What he frequently obtains, as far above Pope's Messiah, as that is above Quarle's Emblems, seems to be the effort of a genius not inferior in strength to any beside Milton. But "his words are put by constraint into their places, where they do their duty, but do it sullenly." Nay I reply, most of his words are so natural and unconstrained, as even those of Waller: though they would certainly have done their duty better, had he taken more pains with them. "He extends his sense from one couplet to another; but without success." I think with great success. I will give the first instance that occurs to my memory:

"Happiness, object of that waking dream,
Which we call life, mistaking; fugitive theme
Of my pursuing verse; ideal shade,
Notional good, by fancy only made,
And by tradition nurst; fallacious fire
Whose dancing beams mislead our fond desire:
Cause of our care and error of our mind!
O hadst thou ever been by heav'n design'd
For Adam and his mortal race, the boon
Entire had been reserv'd for Solomon."——

Were ever lines extended from couplet to couplet with more success than these? Is there any *constraint* here? What lines can flow more freely? More easily? More naturally?

6. But "his numbers commonly want ease, airiness, lightness, and facility." I cannot possibly be of this opinion. Wherever this is proper, as in all his tales, and in

Alma, his numbers have certainly the greatest airiness, lightness, and facility. Nay, "but even what is *smooth* is not *soft*." No? What think you of the Lady's Looking-Glass, (to take one instance out of fifty.) Where will you shew me any *softer numbers* than these?

"Celia and I the other day
Walk'd o'er the sand-hills to the sea:
The setting sun adorn'd the coast,
His beams entire, his fierceness lost;
And on the bosom of the deep
The waves lay only not asleep.
The nymph did like the scene appear,
Serenely pleasant, calmly fair:
Soft fell her words, as flew the air."

In truth, the general fault of Prior's poetry is this; it is not too much, but too little laboured. Pope filed and polished every line: Prior set his words down as fast as he could write, and scarcely polished any of them, with any accuracy, at least only here and there. And the reason is plain: Pope lived by his writings; Prior did not. And again: Pope was a man of much leisure: Prior a man of much business.

7. But to descend from generals to particulars. His tales are certainly the best told of any in the English tongue. And it matters not, whether they were ever told before or not. They never were in the English language. I instance only in two of them, The Lady's Looking-Glass, (mentioned before,) and The English Padlock. In both, the diction is pure, terse, easy, and elegant, in the highest degree. And the moral, both of one and the other, may be of excellent use: particularly that of the latter:

"Be to her virtues very kind:
Be to her faults a little blind:
Let all her ways be unconfin'd,
And clap your padlock—on her mind."

8. But "his amorous effusions have neither gallantry, nor tenderness. They are the dull exercises of one trying

to be amorous by dint of study. When he tries to act the Lover, his thoughts are unaffecting and remote. In his amorous pedantry he exhibits the College."

Surely never was any thing more distant from the truth! "Neither gallantry nor tenderness!" For gallantry, I know not well what it means. But never man wrote with more *tenderness*. Witness the preface to Henry and Emma, with the whole inimitable Poem: witness the story of Abraham. Are these "the dull exercises of one trying to be amorous by dint of study?" Are the thoughts in these "unaffecting and remote?" Yea, "amorous pedantry of a College?" O no! They are the genuine language of the heart. "Unaffecting?" So far from it, that I know not what man of sensibility can read them without tears.

9. But it is said, "Henry and Emma is a dull and tedious dialogue, which excites neither esteem for the man, nor tenderness for the woman." Does it not?—Then I know not with what eyes, or with what heart a man must read it! "Dull and tedious!" See how doctors differ! One who was no bad Poet himself, and no bad judge of Poetry, describing Love, says,

> "Th' immortal glories of the Nut-brown Maid,
> Emblazon'd lively on his shield appear:"

and always spoke of this very Poem as one of the finest in the English language.

10. However, "Alma never had a plan, nor any drift or design." The drift and design of it are tolerably plain. It is a strong satire on that self-conceited tribe of men, who pretend to philosophize upon every thing, natural or spiritual. It keenly exposes those who continually obtrude their own systems upon the world, and pretend to *account* for every thing. His design is, if possible, to make these men less wise in their own conceit, by shewing them how plausibly a man may defend, the oddest system that can be conceived: and he intermixes many admirable reflections, and closes with a very striking conclusion: which points out, where one would least expect it, that *all is vanity*.

11. The strangest sentence of all, is that which is passed upon Solomon. "It wants the power of engaging attention. Tediousness is the most fatal of all faults. The tediousness of this Poem."—Did any one ever discern it before? I should as soon think of tediousness in the second or sixth Æneid! So far from it, that if I dip in any of the three books, I scarce know where to leave off. No! This Poem does not "want the power of engaging the attention of any that have a taste for Poetry: that have a taste for the strongest sense expressed in some of the finest verses that ever appeared in the English tongue."

I cite but one passage for all. It stands in the first book.

"Now when my mind has all the world survey'd,
And found that nothing by itself was made:
When thought has rais'd itself by just degrees,
From valleys crown'd with flowers, and hills with trees—
From all the living that four-footed rove
Along the shore, the meadow, or the grove;
From all that can with fins or feathers fly
Through th' aerial or the wat'ry sky;
From the poor reptile with a reasoning soul,
That miserable master of the whole:
From this great object of the body's eye,
This fair half-round, this ample azure sky,
Terribly large and wonderfully bright,
With stars unnumber'd, and unmeasur'd light:
From essences unseen, celestial names,
Enlight'ning spirits, ministerial flames,
Angels, dominions, potentates, and thrones;
All that in each degree the name of creature owns:
Lift we our reason to that sov'reign cause,
Who blest the whole with life, and bounded it with laws:
Who forth from nothing call'd this comely frame,
His will and act, his word and work the same.
To whom a thousand years are but a day,
Who bade the Light her genial beams display,
And set the Moon, and taught the Sun his way:

Who waking Time, his creature, from the source
Primeval, order'd his predestin'd course:
Himself, as in the hollow of his hand,
Holding obedient to his high command,
The deep abyss, the long-continu'd store,
Where months, and days, and hours, and minutes pour
Their floating parts, and thenceforth are no more.
This Alpha and Omega, first and last,
Who like the potter in a mould has cast
The world's great frame, commanding it to be
Such as the eyes of sense or reason see.
Yet, if he wills, may change or spoil the whole;
May take yon beauteous, mystic, starry roll,
And burn it, like an useless parchment scroll.
May from its basis in one moment pour
This melted earth
Like liquid metal, and like burning ore:
Who, sole in power, at the beginning said,
Let sea, and air, and earth, and heav'n be made,
And it was so: and when he shall ordain,
In other sort, has but to speak again,
And they shall be no more: of this great theme,
This glorious, hallow'd, everlasting Name,
This God I would discourse.

12. Now what has Mr. Pope in all his eleven volumes, which will bear any comparison with this? As elegant a piece as he ever wrote was, "Verses to the Memory of an unfortunate Lady." But was ever any thing more exquisitely injudicious? First, What a subject! An eulogium on a self-murderer! And the execution is as bad as the design: it is a commendation not only of the person, but the act!

"Is it in heav'n a crime to *love too well?*
To bear too tender or too *firm* a heart?
To act a Lover's, or a Roman's part?"

Yes, whatever men may think, it is a crime and no small one, with Him that sitteth in heaven, for any worm of

earth to violate "the canon he hath fixed against self-murder." Nor did any one ever do this out of *firmness* of heart, but for want of *firmness*. "A Roman's part!" Nay, no Roman ever acted this part, but out of rank cowardice. This was the case of Cato in particular. He *did not dare* to receive a favour from Cæsar.

13. But go on:

"Ambition first sprung from your high abodes,
The glorious fault of angels and of gods."

Consummate nonsense! Of *angels* and of *gods!* What is the difference? Are not these angels and gods the very same? That is, in plain English, Devils! Are these subjects of panegyric? Or fit to be recommended to our imitation? And if the fault they were guilty of were so *glorious*, what cruelty was it, to cast them into hell for it?

But what comfort does the Poet provide for the woman that was guilty of this glorious fault? Why this,

"Yet shall thy grave with rising flowers be drest,
And the green turf lie light upon thy breast."

Who would not go to hell, to have the green turf grow upon his grave! Nay, and primroses too! For the Poet assures her,

"There the first roses of the spring shall blow!"

The conclusion of this celebrated Poem is not the least remarkable part of it.

"Life's idle business at one gasp be o'er,
The Muse forgot, and thou belov'd no more!"

Idle business indeed! If we had no better business than this, it is pity that ever we were born! But was this all the business of his life? Did God raise him from the dust of the earth, and breathe into him a living soul, for no other business, than to court a mistress and to make verses! O what a view is here given of an immortal spirit, that came forth from God, and is going back to God!

14. Upon the whole, I cannot but think that the natural understanding of Mr. Prior, was far stronger than that of Mr. Pope: that his judgment was more correct, his learning more extensive, his knowledge of Religion and of the Scriptures far greater. And I conceive his poetical abilities were at least equal to those either of Pope or Dryden. But as Poetry was not his business, but merely the employment of his leisure hours, few of his pieces are so highly finished as most of Mr. Pope's are. But those which he has taken the pains to polish, (as the Ode to the Memory of Col. Villiers, the Paraphrase on the Thirteenth of the Corinthians, and several parts of Solomon) do not yield to any thing that has been written either by Pope, or Dryden, or any English Poet, except Milton.

THOUGHTS ON NERVOUS DISORDERS;

Particularly that which is usually termed Lowness of Spirits.

1. WHEN Physicians meet with disorders which they do not understand, they commonly term them *Nervous:* a word that conveys to us no determinate idea, but it is a good cover for learned ignorance. But these are often no natural disorder of the body, but the hand of God upon the soul, being a dull consciousness of the want of God, and the unsatisfactoriness of every thing here below. At other times it is conviction of sin, either in a higher or a lower degree. It is no wonder that those who are strangers to Religion, should not know what to make of this: and that consequently all their prescriptions should be useless, seeing they quite mistake the cause.

2. But undoubtedly there are Nervous Disorders, which are purely natural. Many of these are connected with other diseases, whether acute or chronical. Many are the

forerunners of various distempers, and many the consequences of them. But there are those, which are not connected with others, being themselves a distinct, original distemper. And this frequently arises to such a height, that it seems to be one species of madness. So one man imagines himself to be made of glass: another thinks he is too tall to go in at the door. This is often termed the *Spleen* or *Vapours:* often *Lowness of Spirits:* a phrase that having scarcely any meaning, is so much the fitter to be given to this unintelligible disorder. It seems to have taken its rise from hence. We sometimes say, A man is in *high spirits*. And the proper opposite to this is, *He is low-spirited*. Does not this imply, that a kind of faintness, weariness, and listlessness affects the whole body, so that he is disinclined to any motion, and hardly cares to move hand or foot? But the mind seems chiefly to be affected, having lost its relish of every thing, and being no longer capable of enjoying the things it once delighted in most. Nay, every thing round about, is not only flat and insipid, but dreary and uncomfortable. It is not strange if to one in this state, life itself is become a burden: yea so insupportable a burden, that many who have all this world can give, desperately rush into an unknown world, rather than bear it any longer.

3. But what are the causes of this strange disorder? One cause is, the use of spirituous liquors. This is one of the horrid effects, which naturally follow the swallowing that fashionable poison. That liquid fire lays the foundation of numberless diseases, and of this in particular. It is amazing that the preparing or selling this poison, should be permitted, I will not say in any Christian country, but in any civilized state. "O, it brings in a considerable sum of money to Government." True; but is it wise to barter men's lives for money? Surely that gold is bought too dear, if it is the price of blood. Does not the strength of every country consist in the number of its inhabitants? If so, the lessening their number is a loss, which no money can compensate. So that it is inexcusable ill-husbandry, to

give the lives of useful men for any sum of money whatever.

4. But a more extensive cause of this disorder than the use of drams, I apprehend is the use of tea: particularly where it is taken either in large quantities, or strong, or without cream and sugar. "Nay, weak tea is far more hurtful." This is a senseless, shameless falsehood. I long drank hot water and sugar instead of tea; and it did me no hurt at all. But three cups of strong tea will now make my hand shake, so that I can hardly write. And let any try the experiment: if any tea make his hand shake, it will not be weak tea, but strong. This has exceedingly increased the number of nervous complaints throughout the three kingdoms. And this furnishes us with a satisfactory answer to the common question, "Why are these complaints so general now, which were scarcely heard of two or three centuries ago?" For this plain reason, Two or three centuries ago, no tea was drank in either Britain or Ireland.

5. But allowing both tea and spirituous liquors to have contributed largely to the increase of Nervous Disorders, yet it may be doubted, whether one or both of them are the principal causes of them. The particular causes of them, (particularly among those who do not work for their living,) are, as Dr. Cadogan justly observes, Indolence, Intemperance, and irregular Passions.

First, Indolence, the not using such a degree of exercise as the constitution requires. To illustrate this. Our body is composed of earth, water, air, and fire; and the two latter are as necessary as the two former. To supply these, that curious engine, the lungs, continually take in the air, to every particle of which a particle of fire is attached, which being detached from it, is mingled with the blood. Now exercise quickens the motion of the lungs, and enables them to collect from the air, a due quantity of fire. The nerves are the conductors of this ethereal fire, vulgarly called the animal spirits. If this is duly diffused through the whole body, we are lively and vigorous. If it [illegible] (which without exercise it cannot be) we soon grow

faint and languid. And if other disorders do not ensue, those termed Nervous surely will, with that whole train of symptoms which are usually comprised in what is termed *Lowness of Spirits.*

6. Intemperance is another principal cause of this: if not intemperance in drink, which is not quite so common, yet intemperance in meat: the taking more of it than nature requires. Dr. Cheyne well observes, it is not generally the quality, but the quantity of what we eat which hurts us. What hurts the nerves in particular is the eating too much animal food, especially at night: much more the eating at one meal, foods of several different kinds. If we consider, how few observe this, we shall not wonder that so many have Nervous Disorders: especially among those that have an opportunity of indulging themselves daily in variety, and who are hereby continually tempted to eat more than nature requires.

7. But there is another sort of intemperance of which, I think, Dr. Cadogan does not take the least notice. And yet it is the source of more Nervous Disorders than even intemperance in food: I mean, intemperance in sleep; the sleeping longer than nature requires. This alone will account for the weak nerves of most of our nobility and gentry. Not that I would insist upon the old rule,

Sex horas quivis poscit, septemq; scholaris;
Octo viator habet; nebulo quisq; novem.

I would allow between six and seven hours at an average, to a healthy man: or an hour more, between seven and eight hours, to an unhealthy man. And I do not remember, that in threescore years, I have known either man or woman, who laid longer in bed than this (whether they slept or not) but in some years they complained of *Lowness of Spirits.*

The plain reason of which seems to be, while we sleep, all the springs of nature are unbent. And if we sleep longer than is sufficient, they are relaxed more than is sufficient, and of course grow weaker and weaker. And if we lie longer in bed, though without sleep, the very posture

relaxes the whole body: much more when we are covered up with clothes, which throw back on the body whatever perspires from it. By this means it is stewed in the moist vapour: it sucks in again, what nature had cast out, and the flesh is as it were parboiled therein, and becomes more and more soft and flabby. And the nerves suffer at least as much hereby as any other part of the habit. I cannot, therefore, but account this, the lying too long in bed, the grand cause of our Nervous Disorders.

8. And this alone sufficiently answers this question, "Why are we more Nervous than our Forefathers?" Because we lie longer in bed: they, rich and poor, slept about eight, when they heard the Curfew-bell, and rose at four; the bell ringing at that hour, (as well as at eight) in every parish in England. We rise (if not obliged to work for our living) at ten, eleven, or twelve. Is it any wonder then, were there no other cause, that we complain of *Lowness of Spirits?*

9. Yet something may be allowed to *Irregular Passions.* For as long as the soul and body are united, these undoubtedly affect the body; the nerves in particular. Even violent joy, though it raises the spirits for a time, does afterwards sink them greatly. And every one knows, what an influence fear has upon our whole frame. Nay even *hope deferred maketh the heart sick;* puts the mind all out of tune. The same effect have all foolish and hurtful desires. *They pierce us through with many sorrows.* They occasion a deep depression of the spirits: so, above all, does inordinate affection: whereby so many refusing to be comforted, sorrow even unto death.

10. But is there no cure for this sore evil? Is there no remedy for Lowness of Spirits? Undoubtedly there is, a most certain cure, if you are willing to pay the price of it. But this price, is not silver, or gold; nor any thing purchaseably thereby. If you would give all the substance of your house for it, it would be utterly despised. And all the medicines under the sun avail nothing in this distemper. The whole *Materia Medica* put together, will do you no

lasting service: they do not strike at the root of the disease: but you must remove the cause, if you wish to remove the effect.

But this cannot be done by your own strength: it can only be done by the mighty power of God. If you are convinced of this, set about it trusting in him, and you will surely conquer.

First, Sacredly abstain from all *Spirituous Liquors*. Touch them not, on any pretence whatever. To others they may sometimes be of use; but to nervous persons they are deadly poison.

Secondly, If you drink any, drink but little tea, and none at all without eating, or without sugar and cream. "But you like it without." No matter: prefer health before taste.

Thirdly, Every day of your life, take at least an hour's exercise, between breakfast and dinner. (If you will, take another hour, before supper, or before you sleep.) If you can, take it in the open air; otherwise, in the house. If you cannot rise, or walk abroad, use within, a dumb bell, or a wooden horse. If you have not strength to do this for an hour at a time, do it at twice or thrice. Let nothing hinder you. Your life is at stake. Make every thing yield to this.

Fourthly, Take no more Food than Nature requires. Dine upon one thing (except pudding or pye.) Eat no flesh at supper; but something light and easy of digestion.

Fifthly, Sleep early and rise early, unless you are ill, never lie in bed much above seven hours. Then you will never lie awake. Your flesh will be firm, and your spirits lively.

Sixthly, Above all,

> "Give not to your passions way;
> God gave them to thee under lock and key."

Beware of anger! Beware of worldly sorrow! Beware of the fear that hath torment! Beware of foolish and

hurtful desires! Beware of inordinate affection! Remember the kind command, "My son, give me thy heart!" Then shall there be no more complaining of *Lowness of Spirits!* But the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep thy heart and mind in Christ Jesus!

Melville-House, May 20, 1784.

THOUGHTS ON GENIUS.

1. I HAVE for many years desired to see something, long, or short, accurately written on the term *Genius*. It is a word almost in every one's mouth, and one that is used by abundance of Writers. Yet I doubt, it is not well understood by one in a hundred of them that use it. I rejoiced therefore to hear, that so eminent a Writer as Dr. Gerrard had published an Essay on the subject. But when I read it, I was disappointed of my hope: it did not in any dedegree answer my expectations. The ingenious and very learned Author did not seem to understand the term at all: nor could I find one proper definition of it throughout the whole Treatise.

2. I hoped, however, to find full satisfaction on the head in Mr. Daff's "Essay on Original Genius:" although I was surprised to observe, it had been published above twenty years before the other. But I was disappointed again. Indeed it undoubtedly contains many judicious remarks. But even here, what should have been done in the very beginning, is not done at all. I want to know first of all, What do you mean by Genius? Give me a definition of it. Pray tell me this, before you say any thing more about it: this is common sense. Without this, you may ramble as long as you please; and leave me just as wise as I was.

3. The word *Genius* was used by the ancient Romans, for a superior Being, good or bad, who they supposed, attended every one from his birth to his death. But in this sense of the word it has nothing to do with the present question: wherein it means, either a quality of the human mind, or a man endued with that quality. Thus we say indifferently, "He *is* a Genius, or *has* a Genius." I would here take it in the latter sense, for the quality which denominates a man a Genius.

4. It is evident, that Genius taken in this sense, is not *Invention:* although that may possibly bear some relation to it. It is not *Imagination:* although this may be allowed to be one ingredient of it. Much less is it *an Association of Ideas:* all these are essentially different from it. So is *Sensation*, on the one hand; and so are *Memory* and *Judgment* on the other: unless by *Judgment* we mean, (as many do,) strength of Understanding. It seems to be an extraordinary capacity of mind; sometimes termed extraordinary talents. This may be more or less extensive: there may be a kind of general Genius, or an extraordinary capacity for many things. Or a particular Genius, an extraordinary capacity for one particular thing: it may be, for one particular science, or one particular art. Thus Homer and Milton had a Genius, an extraordinary capacity, for Poetry. Thus Euclid and Archimedes had a Genius, an extraordinary capacity, for Geometry. So Cicero had a Genius for Oratory, and Sir Isaac Newton for Natural Philosophy. Thus Raphael and Michael Angelo had a Genius, an extraordinary capacity for Painting. And so Purcell and Handel (to mention no more,) had a Genius, an extraordinary capacity, for Music. Whereas Aristotle, Lord Bacon, and a very few beside, seem to have had an universal Genius, an extraordinary capacity to excel in whatever they took in hand.

5. It may be allowed that the word is frequently taken in a lower sense. But it has then a word prefixed to it, to restrain its signification. So we say, A man has a *middling*

Genius; or a *little Genius.* But it is generally taken for an extraordinary capacity of whatever kind.

6. Genius in Philosophy, Poetry, and Oratory, seems to imply a strong and clear understanding, connected with an unusually extensive and lively imagination. In which respect it may truly be said, not only of a Poet, but also of an Orator and Philosopher, *Nascitur non fit:* he has this endowment by Nature, not by Art. Yet it may be granted, that Art may exceedingly improve, what originally sprung from Nature. It may receive assistance likewise from the Memory, (nearly related to the Imagination:) and also from the passions, which on various occasions enliven and strengthen the imagination.

7. It may be observed, I purpose to abstain from using the word *Reason* or *Judgment:* because the word Understanding is less equivocal: and I would always use one and the same word, to express one and the same idea.

8. Both the Writers above-mentioned, suppose *Taste* also to be essential to Genius. And, indeed, it does seem to be, if not an essential part, yet an essential property of it: *Taste* is here a figurative word, borrowed from the sense of *Tasting*, whereby we are enabled, first to judge of, and then to relish our food: so the intellectual *Taste* has a two-fold office: it *judges* and it *relishes.* In the former respect, it belongs to the Understanding; in the latter to the Imagination.

9. To sum up all. Perhaps Genius may be defined, An extraordinary capacity for Philosophy, Oratory, Poetry, or any other Art or Science: the constituent parts whereof are a strong understanding, and a lively imagination; and the essential property, a just taste.

Lambeth, Nov. 8, 1787.

THOUGHTS ON MEMORY.

THERE is a near relation between Memory, Reminiscence, and Recollection. But what is the difference between them? Wherein do they differ from each other? Is not Memory a natural faculty of the mind, which is exerted various ways? And does it not exert itself, sometimes in simply *remembering*, sometimes in *Reminiscence*, or *Recollection?* In simply *remembering* things, the mind of man appears to be rather passive than active. Whether we will or not, we *remember* many things which we have heard or seen, said or done: especially if they were attended with any remarkable pleasure or pain. But in *Reminiscence*, or recalling what is past, the mind appears to be active. Most times, at least, we may or may not recall them as we please. *Recollection* seems to imply something more than simple *Reminiscence;* even the studious collecting and gathering up together all the parts of a conversation or transaction, which had occurred before, but had in some measure escaped from the Memory.

But there is one sort of Memory, which it seems more difficult to understand than any other. You pronounce or hear a discourse, or copy of verses, which fixes upon your Memory. Afterwards you can repeat, in your mind, the words you spoke or heard, without ever once opening your lips, or uttering any articulate sound. There is a kind of inward voice (so we may term it, for want of a better expression) which, like an echo, not only repeats the same words without the least variation, but with exactly the same accent, and the same tone of voice. The same echo repeats any tune you have learned, without the least alteration. Now how is this done? By what faculty of the mind, or the body, or both conjointly? I am as sure of the fact, as I am that I am alive. But who is able to account for it? O! how shall we comprehend the ever-blessed God, when we cannot comprehend ourselves?

Yarmouth, Oct. 21, 1789.

A LETTER TO THE REV. MR. HERVEY.

Oct. 15, 1756.

Dear Sir,

A considerable time since, I sent you a few hasty thoughts which occurred to me on reading the Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio. I have not been favoured with any answer. Yet upon another and a more careful perusal of them, I could not but set down some obvious reflections, which I would rather have communicated, before those Dialogues were published.

In the First Dialogue there are several just and strong observations, which may be of use to every serious reader. In the Second, is not the description often too laboured, the language too stiff and affected? Yet the Reflections on the Creation (in the 31st and following pages) make abundant amends for this. (I cite the pages according to the Dublin edition, having written the rough draught of what follows, in Ireland.)

P. 39. Is *justification* more or less, than God's pardoning and accepting a sinner through the merits of *Christ*? That God herein "reckons the righteousness and obedience which *Christ* performed *as our own*:" I allow, if by that ambiguous expression, you mean only as you here explain

it yourself, "They are as effectual for obtaining our salvation, *as if they were our own* personal qualifications," p. 41.

P. 43. "We are not solicitous as to any *particular* set of *phrases*. Only let men be humbled, as repenting criminals at Christ's feet, let them rely as devoted pensioners on his merits, and they are undoubtedly in the way to a blissful immortality." Then for *Christ's* sake, and for the sake of the immortal souls which He has purchased with his blood, do not dispute for that *particular phrase, The imputed righteousness of Christ.* It is not scriptural; it is not necessary; men who scruple to use, men who never heard the expression, may yet "be humbled, as *repenting criminals*, at his feet, and rely as *devoted pensioners* on his merits." But it has done immense hurt. I have had abundant proof, that the frequent use of this unnecessary phrase, instead of "furthering men's progress in vital holiness," has made them satisfied without any holiness at all; yea, and encouraged them to work all uncleanness with greediness.

P. 45. "To ascribe Pardon to Christ's *passive*, Eternal Life to his *active* righteousness, is fanciful rather than judicious. His universal obedience from his birth to his death, is the one foundation of my hope."

This is unquestionably right. But if it be, there is no manner of need, to make the imputation of his *active* righteousness, a separate and laboured head of discourse. O that you had been content with this plain, scriptural account, and spared some of the Dialogues and Letters that follow!

The Third and Fourth Dialogues contain an admirable illustration and confirmation of the great doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction. Yet even here I observe a few passages, which are liable to some exception.

P. 54. "Satisfaction was made to the Divine Law." I do not remember any such expression in Scripture. This way of speaking of the Law as a *person injured* and to be *satisfied*, seems hardly defensible.

P. 74. "The *death* of *Christ* procured the *pardon* and *acceptance* of believers, even before he came in the flesh."

Yea, and ever since. In this we all agree. And why should we contend for any thing more?

P. 120. "All the benefits of the new covenant, are the *purchase of his blood.*" Surely they are. And after this has been fully proved, where is the need, where is the use, of contending so strenuously, for the *imputation of his righteousness*, as is done in the Fifth and Sixth Dialogues?

P. 135. "If He was our Substitute as to *penal sufferings*, why not, as to *justifying obedience?*"

The former is expressly asserted in Scripture. The latter is not expressly asserted there.

P. 145. "As sin and misery have *abounded* through the first Adam, mercy and grace have *much more abounded* through the Second. So that none can have any reason to complain." No, not if the Second Adam died for all. Otherwise all for whom he did not die, have great reason to complain. For they inevitably *fall* by the first Adam, without any *help* from the Second.

P. 148. "The whole world of believers" is an expression which never occurs in Scripture: nor has it any countenance there: the world in the inspired writings being constantly taken either in a universal or in a bad sense: either for the whole of mankind, or for that part of them who know not God.

P. 149. "In *the* LORD *shall all the house of* Israel *be justified.*" It ought unquestionably to be rendered, "*By* or *through the* LORD." This argument therefore proves nothing. "*Ye are complete in him.*" The words literally rendered are, *Ye are filled with him.* And the whole passage, as any unprejudiced reader may observe, relates to sanctification, not justification.

P. 150. "They are accepted *for Christ's sake:* this is justification through *imputed righteousness.*" That remains to be proved. Many allow the former, who cannot allow the latter.

THERON. "I see no occasion for such *nice distinctions and metaphysical subtleties.*

ASP. You oblige us to make use of them by confounding

these very different ideas, that is, Christ's active and passive righteousness."

I answer, We do not *confound* these: but neither do we *separate* them. Nor have we any authority from Scripture, for either thinking or speaking of one separate from the other. And this whole debate on one of them separate from the other, is a mere *metaphysical subtlety*.

P. 151. "The righteousness which justifies us, is already *wrought out*."—A crude, unscriptural expression! "It was *set on foot, carried on, completed*." O vain philosophy! The plain truth is, *Christ* lived and *tasted death for every man*. And through the merits of his life and death, every believer is justified.

P. 152. "Whoever perverts so glorious a doctrine, shews he never believed." Not so. They who *turn back as a dog to the vomit*, had once *escaped the pollutions of the world by the knowledge of Christ*.

P. 153. "The goodness of God leadeth to repentance." This is unquestionably true. But the *nice, metaphysical* doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, leads not to repentance, but to licentiousness.

P. 154. "The believer *cannot but* add to his faith, works of righteousness." During his first love, this is often true. But it is not true afterwards, as we know and feel by melancholy experience.

P. 155. "We no longer obey, *in order* to lay the foundation for our final acceptance." No: that foundation is already laid in the merits of Christ. Yet we obey, *in order* to our final acceptance through his merits. And in this sense, by obeying we *lay a good foundation, that we may attain eternal life*.

P. 156. "We *establish the law*: we provide for its honour, by the perfect obedience of Christ." Can you possibly think, St. Paul meant this? That such a thought ever entered into his mind? The plain meaning is, We establish both the true sense, and the effectual practice of it: we provide for its being both understood and practised in its full extent.

P. 157. "On those who reject the atonement, just seve-

rity." Was it ever possible for them, not to reject it? If not, how is it just, to cast them into a lake of fire, for not doing what it was impossible they should do? Would it be just (make it your own case) to cast *you* into hell, for not touching heaven with your hand?

P. 159. "Justification is *complete* the first moment we believe, and is incapable of *augmentation*."

Not so: there may be as many *degrees* in the *favour* as in the *image* of God.

P. 190. "St. Paul often mentions *a righteousness imputed:* (not *a* righteousness; never once; but simply *righteousness.)* "What can this be, but *the righteousness of Christ?*" He tells you himself, Rom. iv. 6, *To him that believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly,* Faith *is imputed for righteousness.* "Why is Christ styled *Jehovah our Righteousness?*" Because we are both justified and sanctified through him.

P. 191. "My death, the cause of their forgiveness; my righteousness, the ground of their acceptance."

How does this agree with p. 45, "To ascribe pardon to Christ's *passive*, eternal life to his *active* righteousness, is fanciful rather than judicious?"

P. 195. "He commends such kinds of beneficence *only*, as were exercised to a disciple as such." Is not this a slip of the pen? Will not our Lord then commend, and reward eternally, all kinds of beneficence, provided they flowed from a principle of loving faith? Yea, that which was exercised to a Samaritan, a Jew, a Turk, or a Heathen? Even these I would not term "transient bubbles," though they do not *procure* our justification.

P. 197. "How must our righteousness exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees? Not only in being sincere, but in possessing a *complete* righteousness, even that of Christ." Did our Lord mean this? Nothing less. He specifies in the following parts of his sermon, the very instances wherein the righteousness of a Christian exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees.

P. 198. "He brings this specious *hypocrite* to the test."

*

How does it appear, that he was an *hypocrite?* Our Lord gives not the least intimation of it. Surely he *loved him*, not for his hypocrisy, but his sincerity!

Yet he loved the world, and therefore could not keep any of the commandments in their spiritual meaning. And the keeping of these is undoubtedly the *way* to, though not the *cause* of, eternal life.

P. 200. "*By works his faith was made perfect:* appeared to be true." No: the natural sense of the words is, *By* the grace superadded while he wrought those *works*, *his faith was* literally *made perfect.*

Ibid. "He *that doth righteousness is righteous*——manifests the truth of his conversion." Nay; the plain meaning is, *He* alone *is* truly *righteous*, whose faith worketh by love.

P. 201. "St. James speaks of the *justification of our faith.*" Not unless you mean by that odd expression, our *faith* being *made perfect:* for so the apostle explains his own meaning. Perhaps the word *justified* is once used by St. Paul for *manifested.* But that does not prove it is to be so understood here.

P. 202. "Whoso *doeth these things shall never fall* into total apostasy." How pleasing is this to flesh and blood! But David says no such thing. His meaning is, *Whoso doeth these things* to the end, *shall never fall* into hell.

The Seventh Dialogue is full of important truths. Yet some expressions in it I cannot commend.

P. 216. "*One thing thou lackest*, the imputed righteousness of Christ." You cannot think, this is the meaning of the text. Certainly the *one thing* our Lord meant was, the love of God. This was the thing he lacked.

P. 222. "Is the *obedience* of Christ insufficient to *accomplish* our justification?" Rather I would ask, Is the *death* of Christ insufficient to *purchase* it?

P. 226. "The saints in glory ascribe *the whole* of their salvation to the *blood* of the Lamb." So do I: and yet I believe he "obtained for all a *possibility* of salvation."

P. 227. "The terms of acceptance for *fallen* man were

a *full satisfaction* to the Divine Justice, and a *complete conformity* to the Divine Law." This you take for granted, but I cannot allow.

The *terms* of acceptance for fallen man are *repentance* and *faith*. *Repent ye, and believe the gospel.*

Ibid. "There are but two methods whereby any can be justified, either by a *perfect obedience* to the Law, or because Christ hath kept the law in our stead." You should say, "Or by *faith* in Christ." I then answer, This is true. And fallen man is justified, not by *perfect obedience*, but by *faith*. What Christ has done is the *foundation* of our justification, not the *term* or *condition* of it.

In the Eighth Dialogue likewise there are many great truths, and yet some things liable to exception.

P. 253. "David, God himself dignifies with the *most exalted* of all characters." Far, very far from it. We have more exalted characters than David's, both in the Old Testament and the New. Such are those of Samuel, Daniel, yea, and Job, in the former; of St. Paul and St. John in the latter.

"But God styles him *a man after his own heart*." This is the text which has caused many to mistake! for want of considering, first, That this is said of David in a *particular respect*, not with regard to his *whole character*: secondly, The time at which it was spoken. When was David *a man after God's own heart? When God found* him *following the ewes great with young*, when *he took him from the sheep-folds*, Ps. lxxiii. 71. It was in the second or third year of Saul's reign, that Samuel said to him, *The Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and hath commanded him to be captain over his people*, 1 Sam. xiii. 14. But was he *a man after God's own heart* all his life? Or in all particulars? So far from it, that we have few more exceptionable characters, among all the men of God, recorded in Scripture.

P. 261. "*There is not a just man upon earth that sinneth not*," Solomon might truly say so before Christ came. And St. John might after he came, say as truly, *Whosoever is born of God sinneth not*. "But *in many things we offend*

all." That St. James does not speak this of himself, or of real Christians, will clearly appear, to all who impartially consider the context.

The Ninth Dialogue proves excellently well, that we cannot be *justified by* our *works.*

But have you thoroughly considered the words which occur in the 270th page?

"O children of Adam, you are *no longer* obliged to love God with all your strength, nor your neighbour as yourselves. *Once* indeed I insisted on absolute purity of heart: *now* I can dispense with some degrees of evil desire. Since Christ"—has fulfilled the Law for *you*, "You need not fulfil it. I will *connive* at, yea, accommodate my demands to your weakness."

I agree with you, That "this doctrine makes the Holy One of God a minister of sin." And is it not your own? Is not this the very doctrine which you espouse throughout your book?

I cannot but except to several passages also in the Tenth Dialogue. I ask, First,

P. 291. "Does the *righteousnesss of God* ever mean" (as you affirm) "*The merits of Christ?*" I believe, not once in all the Scripture. It often means, and particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, God's *method of justifying* sinners. When therefore you say,

P. 292. "The righteousness of God means, such a righteousness as may justly challenge his acceptance;" I cannot allow it at all: and this capital mistake must needs lead you into many others. But I follow you step by step.

Ibid. "In order to entitle us to a reward, there must be an imputation of righteousness." There must be an interest in Christ. And then *every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour.*

P. 293. "A rebel may be *forgiven*, without being restored to the dignity of a *son.*" A rebel against an earthly king may; but not a rebel against God. In the very same moment that God forgives us, we are made the sons of God. Therefore this is an idle dispute. For *pardon* and *acceptance*,

though they may be *distinguished*, cannot be *divided*. The words of Job, which you cite, are wide of the question. Those of Solomon prove no more than this, (and who denies it?) That justification implies both *pardon* and *acceptance*.

P. 295. "*Grace reigneth through righteousness unto eternal life*,"—that is, the free love of God brings us through justification and sanctification to glory. *Ibid.* "*That they may receive forgiveness, and a lot among the sanctified*:" that is, that they may receive pardon, holiness, heaven.

Ibid. "Is not the satisfaction made by the death of Christ, sufficient to obtain both our full pardon and final happiness?" Unquestionably it is, and neither of the texts you cite proves the contrary.

P. 296. "If it was requisite for Christ to be baptized, much more to fulfil the moral law."

I cannot prove that either one or the other was requisite *in order* to his *purchasing* redemption for us.

P. 297. "By Christ's sufferings alone, the Law was not satisfied." Yes it was; for it required only the alternative, Obey or die. It requires no man to obey and die too. If any man had perfectly obeyed, he would not have died. *Ibid.* "Where Scripture ascribes *the whole* of our salvation to the death of Christ, a *part* of his humiliation is put for the *whole*." I cannot allow this without some proof. *He was obedient unto death*, is no proof at all; as it does not necessarily imply any more, than that *he died in obedience* to the Father. In some texts there is a *necessity*, of taking a part for the whole. But in these there is no such *necessity*.

P. 300. "Christ *undertook* to do every thing necessary for our redemption:" namely, in a *covenant* made with the Father. It is sure, he *did* every thing necessary: but how does it appear, that he *undertook* this before the foundation of the world, and that by a positive *covenant* between him and the Father?

You think this appears from four texts, 1. From that, *Thou gavest them to me*. Nay, when any believe, *the Father gives them to Christ*. But this proves no such pre-

vious contract. 2. God *hath laid upon him the iniquities of us all.* Neither does this prove any such thing. 3. That expression, *The counsel of peace shall be between them*, does not necessarily imply any more, than that both the Father and the Son would concur in the redemption of man. 4. *According to the counsel of his will*,—that is, in the way or method he had chosen. Therefore neither any of these texts, nor all of them, prove what they were brought to prove. They do by no means prove, that there ever was any such covenant made between the Father and the Son.

P. 301. "The *conditions* of the covenant are recorded, *Lo, I come to do thy will.*" Nay, here is no mention of any covenant, nor any thing from which it can be inferred. "The recompence stipulated in this glorious *treaty*"—But I see not one word of the treaty itself. Nor can I possibly allow the existence of it without far other proof than this. *Ibid.* "Another copy of this grand *treaty* is recorded Isaiah xlix. from the first to the sixth verse." I have read them, but cannot find a word about it, in all those verses. They contain neither more nor less than a prediction of the salvation of the Gentiles.

P. 302. "By the covenant of works, man was bound to obey *in his own person.*" And so he is under the covenant of grace; though not in order to his justification. "The obedience of *our Surety* is accepted instead of *our own.*" This is neither a safe nor a scriptural way of speaking. I would simply say, *We are accepted through the Beloved. We have redemption through his blood.*

P. 303. "The second covenant was not made with Adam, or any of his posterity, but with Christ in those words, *The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.*" For any authority you have from these words, you might as well have said, It was made with the Holy Ghost. These words were not spoken *to* Christ, but *of* him, and give not the least intimation of any such *covenant* as you plead for. They manifestly contain, if not a covenant made with, a promise made to Adam and all his posterity.

P. 303. "Christ, we see, *undertook* to execute the condi-

tions." We see no such thing in this text. We see here only a promise of a Saviour, made by God to man.

Ibid. "It is true, I cannot fulfil the conditions." It is not true. The conditions of the new covenant are, *Repent* and *believe.* And these you can fulfil, through Christ strengthening you. "It is equally true, this is not required at my hands." It is *equally* true, that is, absolutely false. And most dangerously false. If we allow this, Antinomianism comes in with a full tide. "Christ has performed all that was *conditionary for me.*" Has he *repented* and *believed for you?* You endeavour to evade this by saying, "He performed all that was *conditionary* in the *covenant of works.*" This is nothing to the purpose; for we are not talking of that, but of the *covenant of grace.* Now he did not perform all that was *conditionary* in this covenant, unless he repented and believed. "But he did unspeakably more." It may be so. But he did not do this.

P. 308. "But if Christ's *perfect obedience* be our's, we have no more need of pardon than Christ himself." The consequence is good. You have started an objection which you cannot answer. You say indeed, "Yes, we do need pardon; for *in many things we offend all.*" What then, if his *obedience* be *our's*, we still *perfectly obey in him.*

P. 309. "Both the branches of the Law, the *preceptive* and the *penal*, in the case of guilt contracted, must be satisfied." Not so. "Christ by his death alone, (so our church teaches) fully satisfied for the sins of the whole world." The same great truth is manifestly taught in the thirty-first Article. Is it therefore fair, is it honest, for any one to plead the Articles of our Church in defence of absolute predestination? Seeing the seventeenth Article barely *defines* the term, without either affirming or denying the thing: whereas the thirty-first totally overthrows and razes it from the foundation.

Ibid. "Believers who are notorious transgressors *in themselves*, have a sinless obedience *in Christ.*" O Siren Song! Pleasing sound, to James Wheatley! Thomas Williams! James Reiley!

I know not one sentence in the Eleventh Dialogue, which is liable to exception: but that grand doctrine of Christianity, Original Sin, is therein proved by irrefragable arguments.

The Twelfth likewise is unexceptionable, and contains such an illustration of the wisdom of God in the structure of the human body, as I believe cannot be paralleled, in either ancient or modern writers.

The former part of the Thirteenth Dialogue is admirable. To the latter, I have some objections.

Vol. II. P. 44. "Elijah failed in his resignation, and even Moses spake unadvisedly with his lips." It is true: but if you could likewise fix some blot upon venerable Samuel and beloved Daniel, it would prove nothing. For no scripture teaches, that the holiness of Christians is to be measured by that of any Jew.

P. 46. "Do not the *best* of men frequently feel disorder in their affections; do not they often complain, *When I would do good, evil is present with me?*" I believe not. You and I are only able to answer for ourselves. "Do not they say, *We groan, being burthened,*—with the workings of inbred corruption?" You know, this is not the meaning of the text. The whole context shews, the cause of their groaning was their longing *to be with* Christ.

P. 47. "The cure" of sin "will be perfected in heaven." Nay surely, in Paradise, if not sooner. "This is a noble prerogative of the beatific vision." No: it would then come too late. If sin remains in us till the day of judgment, it will remain for ever. "Our present blessedness does not consist in being *free from sin.*" I really think it does. But whether it does or not, if we are not *free from sin*, we are not Christian believers. For to all these the apostle declares, *Being made free from sin, ye are become servants of righteousness*, Rom. vi. 18.

"If we were perfect in piety, (St. John's word is, *perfect in love*,) Christ's priestly office would be superseded." No: we should still need his Spirit (and consequently his intercession) for the continuance of that love from moment to

moment. Besides, we should still be encompassed with infirmities, and liable to mistakes, from which words and actions might follow, even though the heart were all love, which were not exactly right. Therefore in all these respects we should still have need of Christ's priestly office: and therefore as long as he remains in the body, the greatest saint may say,

Every moment, Lord, I need
The merit of thy death.

The text cited from Exodus asserts nothing less than that *iniquity* "cleaves to all *our holy things* till death."

P. 84. "Sin remains, that the righteousness of faith may have its due honour." And will the righteousness of faith have its due honour no longer than sin remains in us? Then it must remain, not only on earth and in Paradise, but in heaven also.—"And the sanctification of the Spirit its proper esteem." Would it not have more esteem, if it were a perfect work?

Ibid. "It (sin) will make us lowly in our own eyes." What, will pride make us lowly? Surely the utter destruction of pride would do this more effectually. "It will make us compassionate." Would not an entire renewal in the image of God make us much more so? "It will teach us to admire the riches of grace." Yea, but a fuller experience of it, by a thorough sanctification of spirit, soul, and body, will make us admire it more. "It will reconcile us to death." Indeed it will not: nor will any thing do this like perfect love.

P. 49. "It will endear the blood and intercession of Christ." Nay, these can never be so dear to any, as to those who experience their full virtue, who are *filled with the fulness of God.* Nor can any "feel their continual need" of Christ, or "rely on him" in the manner which these do.

Dialogue 14. P. 57. "The claims of the Law are all answered." If so, Count Zinzendorf is absolutely in the right: neither God nor man can claim my obedience to it. Is not this Antinomianism without a mask?

P. 59. "Your sins are expiated through the death of Christ, and *a righteousness given you*, by which you have free access to God." This is not scriptural language. I would simply say, *By him we have access to the Father.*

There are many other expressions in this Dialogue, to which I have the same objection, namely, 1. That they are unscriptural, 2. That they directly lead to Antinomianism.

The first Letter contains some very useful heads of self-examination. In the second,

P. 91. I read, "There is *a righteousness* which supplies all that the creature needs. To prove this *momentous* point, is the design of the following sheets."

I have seen such terrible effects of this unscriptural way of speaking, even on those *who had once clean escaped from the pollutions of the world*, that I cannot but earnestly wish, you would speak no otherwise than do the oracles of God. Certainly this *mode of expression* is not *momentous*. It is always *dangerous*, often *fatal*.

Letter III. P. 93. "*Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin had reigned unto death, so might grace* —the free love of God—*reign through righteousness*, through our justification and sanctification, *unto eternal life*," Rom. v. 20, 21. This is the plain, natural meaning of the words. It does not appear, that one word is spoken here about *imputed righteousness:* neither in the passages cited in the next page, from the Common Prayer and the Article. In the Homily, likewise, that phrase is not found at all, and the main stress is laid *on Christ's shedding his blood.* Nor is the *phrase* (concerning the thing, there is no question) found in any part of the Homilies.

P. 101. "If the fathers are not explicit with regard to the imputation of *active* righteousness, they abound in passages which evince the *substitution* of Christ in our stead: passages which disclaim all dependence on any duties of our own, and fix our hopes wholly on the *merits* of our Saviour. When this is the case, I am very little solicitous about any *particular forms of expression.*" O lay aside,

then, those questionable, dangerous forms, and keep closely to the scriptural.

Letter IV. P. 105. "The authority of our Church and of those eminent divines," does not touch those *particular forms of expression:* neither do any of the texts which you afterwards cite. As to the doctrine, we are agreed.

Ibid. "*The righteousness of God* signifies, the righteousness which God-Man wrought out." No. It signifies God's method of justifying sinners.

P. 107. "The victims figured the *expiation* by Christ's death; the clothing with skins, the *imputation* of his righteousness." That does not appear. Did not the one rather figure our justification, the other our sanctification?

P. 109. Almost every text quoted in this and the following Letter, in support of that *particular form of expression*, is distorted above measure from the plain, obvious meaning, which is pointed out by the context. I shall instance in a few, and just set down their true meaning, without any farther remarks.

To *shew unto man his uprightness.* To convince him of God's justice, in so punishing him.

P. 110. *He shall receive the blessing*—pardon—*from the Lord, and righteousness*—holiness—from *the God of his salvation*, the God who saveth him both from the guilt and from the power of sin.

P. 111. *I will make mention of thy righteousness only.*—Of thy *mercy.*—So the word frequently means in the Old Testament. So it unquestionably means in that text, *In* (or by) *thy righteousness shall they be exalted.*

P. 112. *Sion shall be redeemed with judgment*—after severe punishment—*and her converts with righteousness*—with the tender mercy of God, following that punishment.

P. 113. *In* (or *through*) *the Lord I have righteousness and strength*, justification and sanctification. *He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation*,—saved me from the guilt and power of sin: both of which are again expressed by, *He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness.*

P. 114. *My righteousness*—my mercy—*shall not be abolished.*

P. 116. *To make reconciliation for iniquity*—to atone for all our sins—*and to bring in everlasting righteousness*, spotless holiness into our souls. And this righteousness is not *human*, but *divine*. It is the gift and work of God.

P. 117. *The Lord our righteousness*—The Author both of our justification and sanctification.

P. 127. "What righteousness shall give us peace at the last day, inherent or imputed?" Both. Christ died for us and lives in us, *that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.*

Letter V. P. 131. *That have obtained like precious faith through the righteousness*—the mercy—*of our Lord. Seek ye the kingdom of God and his righteousness*—the holiness which springs from God reigning in you.

P. 132. *Therein is revealed the righteousness of God*—God's method of justifying sinners.

P. 135. "*We establish the Law*, as we expect no salvation without a perfect conformity to it—namely, by Christ." Is not this a mere quibble? And a quibble, which after all the laboured evasions of Witsius and a thousand more, does totally *make void the Law?* But not so does St. Paul teach. According to him, *without holiness*, personal holiness, *no man shall see the Lord.* None who is not *himself* conformed to the Law of God here, *shall see the Lord* in glory.

This is the grand, palpable objection to that whole scheme. It directly *makes void the law.* It makes thousands content to live and die *transgressors of the law*, because Christ fulfilled it *for them.* Therefore, though I believe he hath *lived* and *died* for me, yet I would speak very tenderly and sparingly of the former, (and *never*, separately from the latter,) even as sparingly as do the Scriptures, for fear of this dreadful consequence.

P. 138. "*The gift of righteousness* must signify a righteousness not their own." Yes, it signifies the righteousness or holiness which God gives to and works in them.

P. 139. "*The obedience of one* is Christ's actual performance of the whole law." So here his passion is fairly left out! Whereas his *becoming obedient unto death*, that is, dying for man, is certainly the chief, if not the whole, which is meant by that expression.

Ibid. "*That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us*—that is, by our Representative in our nature." Amazing! But this, you say, "agrees with the tenor of the apostle's arguing. For he is demonstrating we cannot be justified by our own conformity to the law." No: not here. He is not speaking here of the *cause* of our justification, but the *fruits* of it. Therefore that unnatural sense of his words does not at all "agree with the tenor of his arguing."

P. 140. I totally deny the criticism on δικαιοσυνη and δικαιωμα, and cannot conceive on what authority it is founded. O how deep an aversion to inward holiness does this scheme naturally create!

P. 142. "The righteousness they attained could not be any personal righteousness." Certainly it was. It was *implanted* as well as *imputed.*

P. 145. "*For instruction in righteousness*, in the righteousness of Christ." Was there ever such a comment before? The plain meaning is, *For training up in holiness* of heart and of life.

P. 146. *He shall convince the world of righteousness*—that I am not a sinner, but innocent and holy.

P. 148. "*That we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* Not intrinsically, but imputatively." Both the one and the other. God *through him*, first *accounts* and then *makes* us *righteous*. Accordingly,

P. 152. *The righteousness which is of God by faith*, is both *imputed* and *inherent.*

P. 153. "My faith fixes on them both, the *meritorious life* and *atoning death* of Christ." Here we clearly agree. Hold then to this, and never talk of the former without the latter. If you do, you cannot say, "Here we are exposed to no hazard." Yes, you are to an exceeding great one:

even the hazard of living and dying without holiness. And then we are lost for ever.

The sixth Letter contains an admirable account of the earth and its atmosphere, and comprises abundance of sense in a narrow compass, and expressed in beautiful language.

P. 177. Gems have "a seat on the virtuous fair one's breast." I cannot reconcile this with St. Paul. He says, *Not with pearls:* by a parity of reason, Not with diamonds. But in all things, I perceive, you are too favourable, both to *the desire of the flesh* and *the desire of the eye.* You are a gentle casuist as to every self-indulgence which a plentiful fortune can furnish.

P. 182. "Our Saviour's obedience"—O say with the good old Puritans, our Saviour's *death* or *merits.* We swarm with Antinomians on every side. Why are you at such pains to increase their number?

P. 194. *My mouth shall shew forth thy righteousness and thy salvation*—thy mercy which brings my salvation.

The eighth Letter is an excellent description of the supreme greatness of Christ. I do not observe one sentence in it, which I cannot cheerfully subscribe to.

The ninth Letter, containing a description of the sea, with various inferences deduced therefrom, is likewise a master-piece, for justness of sentiment, as well as beauty of language. But I doubt whether, "mere *shrimps,*" p. 241, be not too low an expression: and whether you might not as well have said nothing of "cod, the standing repast of Lent:" or concerning "the exquisite relish of turbet, or the deliciousness of sturgeon." Are not such observations beneath the dignity of a minister of Christ? I have the same doubt concerning what is said, p. 264, of "delicately flavoured tea, finely scented coffee; the *friendly bowl,* the pyramid of Italian figs, and the pastacia nut of Aleppo." Beside that, the mentioning these in such a manner is a strong encouragement of luxury and sensuality. And does the world need this? The *English* in particular? *Si non insaniunt satis suâ sponte, instiga.*

Letter X. P. 271. "Those treasures which spring from the imputation of *Christ's righteousness*." Not a word of his *atoning blood?* Why do so many men love to speak of his righteousness rather than his atonement? I fear, because it affords a fairer excuse for their own unrighteousness. To cut off this, is it not better, to mention both together? At least never to name the former without the latter?

P. 285. "Faith is a persuasion that Christ has shed his blood *for me*, and fulfilled all righteousness *in my stead*." I can by no means subscribe to this definition. There are hundreds, yea, thousands of true believers, who never once thought one way or the other, of Christ's fulfilling all righteousness *in their stead*. I personally know many, who to this very hour have no idea of it; and yet have each of them a divine evidence and conviction, *Christ loved me, and gave himself for me*. This is St. Paul's account of faith: and it is sufficient. He that *thus* believes is justified.

P. 287. "It is a *sure* means of purifying the heart, and *never fails* to work by love." It *surely* purifies the heart—if we *abide in it;* but not if we *draw back to perdition*. It *never fails* to work by love, while it continues; but if itself fail, farewell both love and good works.

"Faith is the hand which receives all that is laid up in Christ." Consequently, if we *make shipwreck of the faith*, how much soever is laid up in Christ, from that hour we receive nothing.

Letter XI. P. 288. "Faith in the *imputed righteousness* of Christ, is a fundamental principle in the Gospel." If so, what become of all those who think nothing about *imputed righteousness?* How many who are full of faith and love, if this be true, must perish everlastingly!

P. 297. "Thy hands must urge the way of the deadly weapon through the shivering flesh, till it be plunged in the throbbing heart." Are not these descriptions far too strong? May they not occasion unprofitable reasonings in many readers?

Ne puerum coram populo Media trucidet.

P. 298. "How can he *justify* it to the world?" Not at all. Can this then *justify his faith* to the world?

P. 304. "You take the certain way to obtain comfort, the righteousness of Jesus Christ." What, without the atonement? Strange fondness for an unscriptural, dangerous *mode of expression!*

P. 306. "So the merits of Christ are derived to all the faithful." Rather the fruits of the Spirit: which are likewise plainly typified by the oil in Zechariah's vision.

P. 310. "Has the Law any demand? It must go to him for satisfaction." Suppose, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Then I am not obliged to love my neighbour. *Christ* has satisfied the demands of the Law *for me.* Is not this the very quintessence of Antinomianism?

P. 311. "The righteousness wrought out by Jesus Christ, is wrought out for *all his people*, to be *the cause* of *their* justification, and *the purchase* of their salvation. *The righteousness* is the cause, the purchase." So the *death* of Christ is not so much as named! "For *all his* people." But what becomes of *all other people?* They *must inevitably* perish for ever. The die was cast or ever they were in being. The doctrine to *pass them by*, has

Consign'd their unborn souls to hell,
And damn'd them from their mother's womb!

I could sooner be a Turk, a Deist, yea, an Atheist, than I could believe this. It is less absurd to deny the very being of God, than to make him an Almighty Tyrant.

P. 318. "The whole world and all its seasons, are rich with our Creator's goodness. His tender mercies are over all his works." Are they over the bulk of mankind? Where is his goodness to the non-elect? How are his tender mercies over *them?* "His temporal blessings are given *to them.*" But are they to them blessings at all? Are they not all curses? Does not God *know* they are? That they will only increase their damnation? Does not he *design* they should? And this you call *goodness!* This is *tender mercy!*

P. 321. "May we not discern pregnant proofs of good-

ness in each individual object?" No; on your scheme not a spark of it in this world or the next, to the far greater part of the work of his own hands!

P. 334. "Is God a generous Benefactor to the meanest animals, to the lowest reptiles? And will he deny my friend what is necessary to his present comfort, and his final acceptance?" Yea, will he deny it to any soul that he has made? Would *you* deny it to any, if it were in *your* power?

But if you *lov'd* whom God abhorr'd,
The servant were above his Lord.

P. 337. The *wedding-garment* here means holiness.

P. 340. "This is his tender complaint, They *will not come* unto me!" Nay, that is not the case; they *cannot*. He himself has *decreed*, not to give them that grace without which their coming is impossible!

"The grand end which God proposes in all his favourable dispensations to fallen man, is to demonstrate the sovereignty of his grace." Not so: to impart happiness to his creatures, is his grand end herein. "Barely to demonstrate his sovereignty," is a principle of action fit for the great Turk, not the Most High God.

P. 341. "God hath pleasure in the prosperity of his servants. He is a boundless Ocean of good." Nay, that Ocean is far from boundless, if it wholly passes by nine tenths of mankind.

P. 342. "You cannot suppose God would enter into a fresh covenant with a rebel." I both suppose and know he did. "God made the new covenant with *Christ*, and charged him with the performances of the conditions." I deny both these assertions, which are the central point wherein Calvinism and Antinomianism meet. "*I have made a covenant with my chosen.*"—Namely, with *David my servant*. So God himself explains it.

P. 362. "He will wash you in the blood which atones, and invest you with the righteousness which justifies." Why should you thus continually put asunder what God has joined?

P. 440. "God himself at the last day pronounces them

righteous, because they are interested in the obedience of the Redeemer." Rather, because they are washed in his blood, and renewed by his Spirit.

Upon the whole, I cannot but wish that the plan of these Dialogues had been executed in a different manner. Most of the grand truths of Christianity are herein both explained and proved with great strength and clearness. Why was any thing intermixed, which could prevent any serious Christian's recommending them to all mankind? Any thing which must necessarily render them exceptionable to so many thousands of the children of God? In practical writings I studiously abstain from the very shadow of controversy. Nay, even in controversy, I do not knowingly write one line, to which any but my opponent would object. For *Opinions* shall I destroy the work of God? Then am I a bigot indeed. Much more if I would not drop any *mode of expression*, rather than offend either Jew or Gentile, or the church of God.

I am, with great sincerity, Dear Sir,

Your affectionate Brother and Servant,

J. W.

LETTERS.

TO THE REV. MR. HERVEY.

London, Nov. 29, 1758.

DEAR SIR,

A WEEK or two ago, in my return from Norwich, I met with Mr. Pierce, of Bury, who informed me of a conversation which he had had a few days before. Mr. Cudworth, he said, then told him, "that he had prevailed on Mr. Hervey to write against me, who likewise in what he had written referred to the book which he (Mr. Cudworth) had lately published."

Every one is welcome to write what he pleases concerning me. But would it not be well for you to remember, that before I published any thing concerning you, I sent it to you in a private letter. That I waited for an answer for several months; but was not favoured with one line: that when at length I published part of what I had sent you, I did it in the most inoffensive manner possible; in the latter end of a larger work, purely designed to *preserve* those in connexion with me from being tossed to and fro by various doctrines. What therefore I may fairly expect from my friend, is, to mete me with the same measure. To send to me first in a private manner, any complaint he has against me; to wait as many months as I did; and if I give you none, or no satisfactory answer, then to lay the matter before the world, if you judge it will be to the glory of God.

But whatever you do in this respect, one thing I request of you. Give no countenance to that insolent, scurrilous, virulent libel, which bears the name of William Cudworth. Indeed, how you can converse with a man of his spirit, I cannot comprehend. O leave not your old, well-tried

friends! The new is not comparable to them. I speak not this because I am *afraid* of what any one can say or do to *me*. But I am really concerned for *you:* an evil man has gained the ascendant over you, and has persuaded a dying man, who had shunned it all his life, to enter into controversy as he is stepping into eternity! Put off your armour, my brother! You and I have no moments to spare, let us employ them all in promoting peace and good-will among men. And may the peace of God keep your heart and mind in Christ Jesus! So prays,

Your affectionate Brother and Servant,

J. WESLEY.

TO THE REV. MR. WALKER.

DIFFICULTIES WITH REGARD TO THE CHURCH.

Bristol, September 24, 1755.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

1. YOU greatly oblige me by speaking your thoughts so freely, and the more by giving me hopes of seeing your further sentiments on so nice and important an affair. I did not delay one day to follow your advice with regard to Mr. Adams, but sent him, by the very next post, a copy of those papers; although I am satisfied already as to the publishing them, and have laid aside that design: the reasons you urge against the expediency of it, being abundantly sufficient. But you seem a little to misapprehend what we speak of, hearing Predestinarian preachers. We find by long experience, that this is "deadly poison," not *in itself*, but *to the members of our Societies*. This we know to be an unquestionable truth: and it was a truth necessary to be observed, nay, and strongly insisted on (though without any design of bearing hard on any particular person) when many were enlarging on "the poisonous doctrines" which they heard at many of their parish churches.

2. All that you say concerning the inexpediency of a separation from the Church, I readily allow: as likewise, that the first and main question must be, Is it lawful to separate? Accordingly, this was debated first, and that at large, in seven or eight long conversations. And it was then only, when we could not agree concerning this, that we proceeded to weigh the expediency of it.

3. As to the grounds on which those who plead for a separation from the Church proceed, some of them have weighed the point long and deeply. They have very particularly, and with earnest and continued prayer, considered the lawfulness of it. And they allow, "If it be lawful to abide therein, then it is not lawful to separate." But they aver, "It is not lawful to abide therein:" and that for the following reasons:

First, With regard to the Liturgy itself: though they allow it is, in the general, one of the most excellent human compositions that ever was, yet they think it is both absurd and sinful, to declare such an assent and consent as is required, to a merely human composition. Again, though they do not object to the use of forms, yet they dare not confine themselves to them. And in this form (the book of Common-Prayer) there are several things which they apprehend to be contrary to Scripture.

Secondly, As to the laws of the Church, if they include the Canons and Decretals, (both which are received as such in our courts,) they think "the latter are the very dregs of "Popery, and that many of the former, the Canons of "1603, are as grossly wicked as absurd." And over and above the objections which they have to several particular ones, they think, "1. That the spirit which they breathe is "throughout truly Popish and antichristian. 2. That no-"thing can be more diabolical, than the *ipso facto* excom-"munication so often denounced therein. 3. That the "whole method of executing these Canons, the process "used in our spiritual courts, is too bad to be tolerated "(not merely in a Christian, but even) in a Mahometan "or Pagan nation."

Thirdly, With respect to the ministers, they doubt, "Whether there are not many of them whom God hath not "sent, inasmuch as they neither live the gospel, nor teach "it; neither indeed can, seeing they do not know it." They doubt the more, "because themselves disclaim that "inward call to the ministry, which is at least as necessary "as the outward." And they are not clear, "Whether it be "lawful to attend the ministrations of those whom God "has not sent to minister?"

Fourthly, The doctrines actually taught by these, and indeed by a great majority of the Church-ministers, they think "are not only wrong, but fundamentally so, and subversive of the whole Gospel." They therefore doubt, "Whether it be lawful to bid them God speed, or to have "any fellowship with them."

I will freely acknowledge, that I cannot answer these arguments to my own satisfaction. So that my conclusion, which I cannot yet give up, 'That it is lawful to continue 'in the Church,' stands, I know not how, almost without any premises that are able to bear its weight.

My difficulty is very much increased by one of your observations, I know the original doctrines of the Church are sound: I know her worship (is in the main) pure and scriptural. But if "the essence of the Church of England, considered as such, consists in her Orders and Laws," (many of which I myself can say nothing for,) "and not in her "Worship and Doctrines," those who separate from her, have a far stronger plea than I was ever sensible of.

4. At present I apprehend those, and those only, to separate from the Church, who either renounce her fundamental doctrines, or refuse to join in her public worship. As yet we have done neither: nor have we taken one step further than we were convinced was our bounden duty. It is from a full conviction of this, that we have, 1. Preached abroad; 2. Prayed extempore; 3. Formed Societies; and, 4. Permitted Preachers who were not episcopally ordained. And were we pushed on this side; were there no alternative allowed, we should judge it our bounden duty, rather wholly to sepa-

rate from the Church, than to give up any one of these points. Therefore, if we cannot stop a separation without stopping lay-preachers, the case is clear: we cannot stop it at all.

5. "But if we permit them, should we not do more? "Should we not appoint them rather? Since the bare per-"mission puts the matter quite out of our hands, and de-"prives us of all our influence?" In a great measure, it does: therefore to appoint them is far more expedient, if it be lawful. But is it lawful for Presbyters, circumstanced as we are, to appoint other ministers? This is the very point wherein we desire advice, being afraid of leaning to our own understanding.

It is undoubtedly needful (as you observe) to come to some "resolution in this point;" and the sooner the better. I therefore rejoice to hear, that you think "this matter "may be better, and more inoffensively ordered; and, that "a method may be found, which, conducted with prudence "and patience, will reduce the constitution of Methodism "to due order, and render the Methodists, under God, "more instrumental to the ends of practical religion."

This, Sir, is the very thing I want. I must therefore beg your sentiments on this head; and that as particularly as your other engagements will allow. Wishing you more and more of the wisdom from above, I remain, Rev. Dear Sir,

Your obliged and affectionate

Brother and Servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

TO THE SAME.

Kingswood, Sept 3, 1756.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I HAVE one point in view, To promote, so far as I am able, vital, practical religion; and, by the grace of God, to beget, preserve, and increase, the life of God in the souls

of men. On this single principle I have hitherto proceeded, and taken no step but in subserviency to it. With this view, when I found it to be absolutely necessary for the continuance of the work which God had begun in many souls (which their *regular pastors* generally used all possible means to destroy,) I permitted several of their brethren, whom I believed God had called thereto, and qualified for the work, to comfort, exhort, and instruct those who were athirst for God, or who walked in the light of his countenance. But as the persons so qualified were few, and those who wanted their assistance very many, it followed, that most of these were obliged to travel continually from place to place; and this occasioned several regulations from time to time, which were chiefly made in our Conferences.

So great a blessing has, from the beginning, attended the labours of these itinerants, that we have been more and more convinced every year, of the more than lawfulness of this proceeding. And the inconveniences, most of which we saw from the very first, have been both fewer and smaller than were expected, Rarely two in one year, out of the whole number of preachers, have either separated themselves or been rejected by us. A great majority have all along behaved as becometh the gospel of Christ, and, I am clearly persuaded, still desire nothing more than to spend and be spent for their brethren.

But the question is, "How may these be settled on such "a footing, as one would wish they might be after "my death?" It is a weighty point, and has taken up many of my thoughts for several years: but I know nothing yet. The steps I am now to take are plain. I see broad light shining upon them; but the other part of the prospect I cannot see; clouds and darkness rest upon it.

Your *general* advice on this head, "To follow my own "conscience, without any regard to consequences, or pru-"dence, so called," is unquestionably right. And it is a rule which I have closely followed for many years, and hope to follow to my life's end. The first of your *particular*

advices is, "To keep in full view the interests of Christ's "Church in general, and of practical religion; not consi-"dering the Church of England, or the cause of Methodism "but as subordinate thereto." This advice I have punctually observed from the beginning, as well as at our late Conference. You advise, 2. "To keep in view also, the "unlawfulness of a separation from the Church of Eng-"land." To this likewise I agree. It cannot be lawful to separate from it, unless it be unlawful to continue in it. You advise, 3. "Fully to declare myself on this head, and "to suffer no dispute concerning it." The very same thing I wrote to my brother from Ireland. And we have declared ourselves without reserve. Nor was there any at the Conference otherwise minded. Those who would have aimed at dispute had left us before. 4. All our preachers as well as ourselves, purpose to continue in the Church of England. Nor did they ever before, so freely and explicitly declare themselves on this subject.

Your last advice is, "That as many of our preachers as "are fit for it, be ordained; and that the others be fixed "to certain societies, not as preachers, but as readers or "inspectors."

You oblige me by speaking your sentiments so plainly: with the same plainness I will answer. So far as I know myself, I have no more concern for the reputation of Methodism, or my own, than for the reputation of Prester John. I have the same point in view, as when I set out, The promoting as I am able, vital, practical religion: and in all our discipline, I still aim at the continuance of the work, which God has already begun in so many souls. With this view, and this only, I permitted those whom I believed God had called thereto, to comfort, exhort, and instruct their brethren. And if this end can be better answered some other way, I shall subscribe to it without delay.

But is that which you propose a better way? This should be coolly and calmly considered.

If I mistake not, there are now in the County of Corn-

wall, about four and thirty of these little Societies, part of whom now experience the love of God; part are more or less earnestly seeking it. Four preachers, Peter Jaco, Thomas Johnson, W. Crabb, and Wm. Alwood, design for the ensuing year, partly to call other sinners to repentance, but chiefly to feed and guide those few feeble sheep: to forward them, according to the ability which God giveth, in vital, practical religion.

Now suppose we can effect, That Peter Jaco, and Thomas Johnson, be ordained and settled in the Curacies of Buryan and St. Just: and suppose William Crabb, and William Alwood, fix at Launceston and the Dock, as readers and exhorters: will this answer the end which I have in view, so well as travelling through the county?

It will not answer it so well, even with regard to those societies with which Peter Jaco and Thomas Johnson have settled. Be their talents ever so great, they will, ere long, grow dead themselves, and so will most of those that hear them. I know, were I myself to preach one whole year in one place, I should preach both myself and most of my congregation asleep. Nor can I ever believe, it was ever the will of our Lord, That any congregation should have one teacher only. We have found by long and constant experience, that a frequent change of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew, has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation.

But suppose this would better answer the end with regard to those two societies, would it answer in those where W. Alwood and W. Crabb, were settled as inspectors or readers? First, who shall feed them with the milk of the word? The ministers of their parishes? Alas, they cannot: they themselves neither know, nor live, nor teach the gospel. These readers? Can then either they, or I, or you, always find something to read to our congregation, which will be as exactly adapted to their wants, and as much blessed to them as our preaching? And here is ano-

ther difficulty still: what authority have I to forbid their doing what I believe God has called them to do? I apprehend, indeed, that there ought, if possible, to be both an outward and inward call to this work: yet, if one of the two be supposed wanting, I had rather want the outward than the inward call. I rejoice that I am called to preach the gospel both by God and man. Yet I acknowledge, I had rather have the divine without the human, than the human without the divine call.

But waving this, and supposing these four societies to be better provided for than they were before: what becomes of the other thirty? Will they prosper as well when they are left as sheep without a shepherd? The experiment has been tried again and again; and always with the same event: even the strong in faith grew weak and faint: many of the weak made shipwreck of the faith. The awakened fell asleep; sinners changed for a while, returned as a dog to the vomit. And so, by our lack of service, many of the souls perished for whom Christ died. Now had we willingly withdrawn our service from them, by voluntarily settling in one place, what account of this could we have given to the great Shepherd of all our souls.

I cannot, therefore, see how any of those four preachers, or any others in like circumstances, can ever, while they have health and strength, ordained or unordained, fix in one place, without a grievous wound to their own conscience, and damage to the *general* work of God. Yet I trust I am open to conviction; and your farther thoughts on this or any subject, will be always acceptable to,

Rev. and dear Sir,

Your very affectionate Brother
and Fellow-Labourer,
J. W.

TO THE REV. MR. WALKER,

ON HIS ADVISING TO GIVE UP THE METHODIST SOCIETIES TO THEIR SEVERAL SOCIETIES.

Helston, Sept. 16, 1757.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

NOTHING can be more kind than the mentioning to me whatever you think is amiss in my conduct. And the more freedom you use in doing this, the more I am indebted to you. I am thoroughly persuaded, that you "wish me well;" and that it is this, together with a "concern for the common interests of Religion," which obliges you to speak with more plainness than otherwise you would. The same motives induce me to lay aside all reserve, and tell you the naked sentiments of my heart.

Two years since, eleven or twelve persons of Falmouth were members of our Society. Last year I was informed, that a young man there had begun to teach them new opinions, and that soon after, offence and prejudice crept in, and increased till they were all torn asunder. What they have done since, I know not: for they have no connection with us. I do "exert myself" so far, as to separate from us, those that separate from the Church. But in a thousand other instances I feel the want of more resolution and firmness of spirit. Yet sometimes that may appear irresolution which is not so. I exercise as little authority as possible, because I am afraid of people's depending upon me too much, and paying me more reverence than they ought.

But I proceed to the substance of your letter. You say, 1. "If you still hold the essence of justifying faith to "be an Assurance, why did you encourage J. H. to believe "his state good?"

Assurance is a word I do not use, because it is not scriptural. But I hold, that a divine evidence or conviction,

that *Christ loved me*, and gave himself for *me*, is essential to, if not the very essence of justifying faith. J. H. told me he had more than this; even a clear conviction that his sins were forgiven: although he said, that conviction was not so clear now, as it had been in times past.

2. "If you believed Mr. V. to be a gracious person, and a gospel minister, why did you not in justice to your people, leave them to him?"

J. H. assured me, That Mr. V. also had a clear conviction of his being reconciled to God. If so, I could not deny his being a gracious person. And I heard him preach the *true*, though not the whole Gospel. But had it been the whole, there are several reasons still, why I did not give up the people to him. 1. No one mentioned or intimated any such thing, nor did it once enter into my thoughts. But if it had, 2. I do not know, that every one who preaches the truth, has wisdom and experience to guide and govern a flock: I do not know that Mr. V. in particular has. He may, or he may not. 3. I do not know, whether he would or could give that flock, all the advantages for holiness which they now enjoy: and to leave them to him, before I was assured of this, would be neither justice nor mercy. 4. Unless they were also assured of this, they could not, in conscience, give up themselves to him. And I have neither right nor power to dispose of them contrary to their conscience.

"But they are his already by legal establishment." If they receive the Sacrament from him thrice a year, and attend his ministrations on the Lord's Day, I see no more which the law requires. But, to go a little deeper into this matter of *legal Establishment*. Does Mr. Canon or you think, that the King and Parliament have a right to prescribe to me, what pastor I shall use? If they prescribe one which I know God never sent, am I obliged to receive him? If he be sent of God, can I receive him with a clear conscience till I know he is? And even when I do, if I believe my former Pastor is more profitable to my soul,

can I leave him without sin? Or has any man living a right to require this of me?

I "extend this to every gospel minister in England." Before I could with a clear conscience, leave the Methodist Society even to such a one, all these considerations must come in.

And with regard to the People: far from thinking, that "the withdrawing our Preachers" from such a Society without their consent, would prevent a Separation from the Church, I think it would be the direct way to cause it. While we are with them, our advice has weight, and keeps them to the Church. But were we totally to withdraw, it would be of little or no weight. Nay, perhaps Resentment of our unkindness (as it would appear to them) would prompt them to act in flat opposition to it. "And will it not be the "same at your death?" I believe not: for I believe there will be no resentment in this case. And the last advice of a dying friend, is not likely to be so soon forgotten.

3. But "was there no inconsistency in your visiting "Mr. V. as a minister of the Gospel, when you do not "give up your people to him?" My visiting him as a gospel minister, did not imply any obligation so to do.

4. "If that was not the design of the visit, you should "not have visited him at all." Does that follow, I visited him as a Brother and a Fellow-labourer, because he desired it.

5. "Does not this conduct on the whole, savour of a party spirit? And shew a desire to please the Methodists, as Methodists?"

I am not conscious of any such spirit, or of any desire but that of pleasing all men, for their good, to edification. And I have as great a desire thus to please you, as any Methodist under heaven.

You add one thing more, which is of deep importance, and deserves a particular consideration. "You spake to "Mr. Vowler of your being as one man. Nothing is so de-"sirable. But really before it can be effected, something "must be done on your part, more than paying us visits;

"which, as far I can see, can serve no other purpose in the "present circumstances, than to bring us under needless "difficulties."

I did indeed speak to Mr. V. of our being as *one man*. And not to him only, but to several others; for it lay much upon my heart. Accordingly I proposed that question to all who met at our late Conference, "What can be done, in order to a close union with the Clergy, who preach the truth?" We all agreed, that nothing could be more desirable. I, in particular, have long desired it; not from any view to my own ease, or honour, or temporal convenience in any kind: but because I was deeply convinced, it might be a blessing to my own soul, and a means of increasing the general work of God.

But you say, "Really before it can be effected, some-"thing must be done on your part." Tell me what, and I will do it without delay; however contrary it may be to my ease, or natural inclination: provided only, that it consists with my keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. It would not consist with this to give up the flock under my care, to any other minister, till I and they were convinced, they would have the same advantages for holiness under him which they now enjoy. But "paying us visits, can serve no other purpose, than "to bring us under needless difficulties." I will speak very freely on this head. Can our conversing together serve no other purpose? You seem then not to have the least concern of *your own* wanting any such thing! But whether you do or not, I feel I do: I am not *in memet totus teres atq; totundus*. I want more light, more strength, for my personal walking with God. And I know not, but He may give it me through you. And whether you do or not, I want more light and strength, for guiding the flock, committed to my charge. May not the Lord send this also by whom he will send? And by you as probably as by any other. It is not improbable that he may by you give me clearer light, either as to Doctrine or Discipline. And [illegible] thereby, how much comfort and profit might redound

to thousands of those for whom Christ hath died? Which, I apprehend, would abundantly compensate any *difficulties* that might arise from such conversation.

But what difficulties are those? All that are the necessary consequence of sharing our reproach. And what reproach is it which we bear? Is it the reproach of Christ, or not? It arose first, while my Brother and I were at Oxford, from our endeavouring to be real Christians. It was increased abundantly when we began to preach Repentance and Remission of Sins: and insisting, that we are justified by Faith. For this cause were we excluded from preaching in the Churches: (I say, for *this:* as yet there was no Field-preaching.) And this exclusion occasioned our preaching elsewhere, with the other irregularities that followed. Therefore all the reproach consequent thereon, is no other than the reproach of Christ.

And what are we worse for this? It is not pleasing to flesh and blood: but is it any hinderance to the work of God? Did he work more by us when we were honourable men? By no means. God never used us to any purpose, till we were a proverb of reproach. Nor have we now a jot more of dishonour, of evil report, than we know is necessary both for us and for the people, to balance that honour and good report, which otherwise could not be borne.

You need not, therefore, be so much afraid of, or so careful to avoid this. It is a precious balm: it will not break your head, neither lessen your usefulness. And indeed, you cannot avoid it, any otherwise than by departing from the work. You do not avoid it by standing aloof from us; what you call *Christian*, I call *worldly* prudence.

I speak as a fool: bear with me. I am clearly satisfied, that you have far more faith, more love, and more of the mind that was in Christ than I have. But have you more gifts for the work of God? Or more fruit of your labour? Has God owned you more? I would he had, a thousand fold! I pray God, that he may! Have you at present more experience of the wisdom of the World and the

devices of Satan? Or of the manner and method wherein it pleases God to counter-work them in this period of his Providence? Are you sure, God would add nothing to you by me, (beside what He might add to me by you?) Perhaps when the time is slipped out of your hands, when I am no more seen, you may wish you had not rejected the assistance of, even

Your affectionate Brother,

J. W.

TO THE REV. MR. WALKER.

October 1758.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I RETURN you many thanks for the welcome Letter from Mr. Adam, as well as for your own. I have answered his, (which is written in a truly Christian spirit,) and now proceed to consider yours. After having observed, That two of our Preachers are gone from us, and none of these remaining (to my knowledge,) have at present, any *desire* or *design* of separating from the Church, yet I observe,

1. Those Ministers who truly feared God near a hundred years ago, had undoubtedly much the same objections to the Liturgy, which some (who never read their works,) have now. And I myself so far allow the force of several of those objections, that I should not dare to declare my assent and consent to that book in the terms prescribed. Indeed they are so strong, that I think they cannot safely be used, with regard to any book but the Bible. Neither dare I confine myself wholly to Forms of Prayer, not even in the Church. I use indeed all the Forms: but I frequently add extemporary Prayer, either before or after Sermon.

2. In behalf of many of the Canons, I can say little; of the Spiritual Courts, nothing at all. I dare not, therefore,

allow the authority of the former, or the jurisdiction of the latter. But I am not yet required to do it. So that difficulty does not lie in my way yet.

3. "Whether it be lawful to attend the ministrations of one, whom I know God has not sent to minister, seeing he expressly disclaims that call of God, which is at least as necessary as the call of man:" is really a question which (as I said before) I cannot answer to my own satisfaction. Neither can I tell,

4. How far that command of our Lord, *Beware of false prophets*, obliges me to refrain from hearing such, as put darkness for light and light for darkness. I am still in doubt, whether quietly attending them while they do this, be not, in effect, the *bidding them God speed:* the strengthening their hands in evil, and encouraging others to hear them, till they fall into hell together.

I am still desirous of knowing, in what particular manner you think the present work of God could be carried on, without the assistance of Lay-preachers. This I will fairly weigh, and give you my thoughts upon it.

Some little things occurred to me in reading over your Sermons, which I had a desire to communicate to you. In the great points I cannot observe any difference between us. We both contend for the Inward Kingdom, the mind that was in Christ Jesus, the Image of God to be new stamped upon the heart. I am sometimes much discouraged at finding so little of this in myself. Assist both with your advice and prayers,

Dear Sir,

Your very affectionate Brother and Servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

END OF VOL. FIFTEEN.

CONFERENCE-OFFICE, 14, CITY-ROAD;
T. CORDEU AGENT.